

873. K 20
2

A
R E P L Y
T O
H. B's VINDICATION
O F
Robert Barclay's
A P O L O G Y, &c.

By WILLIAM NOTCUTT.

I will give you a Mouth and Wisdom which all your Adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist. Luke 21. 15.

The Prophet that hath a Dream, let him tell a Dream; and he that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully: What is the Chaff to the Wheat? saith the Lord. Jer. 23. 28.

Am I therefore become your Enemy, because I tell you the Truth. Gal. 4. 16.

I P S W I C H:

Printed and Sold by JOHN BAGNALL, in St. Nicholas's-Street. R HETT at the Bible and Crown in the Poultry; and THO. COX at the Lamb under the Piazzas of the Royal-Exchange, London. M.D.CC.XXXIII.
(Price One-Shilling and Six-pence.)

REPLY

TO THE VINDICATION

OF THE
NEW THEORY
OF APOLOGY

43

4

6

5/4



H



the
the
reg
the
tion
thi
I
fir
dis



A
R E P L Y
 T O
H. B's VINDICATION, &c.

The INTRODUCTION.



IN the Perusal of *H. B's Vindication of R. Barclay*, which I suppose is the Performance of a chosen Champion of their Cause, I was not at all surpriz'd at the censorious Spirit that manifestly runs thro' the whole of it; and that the Author, without any regard to Truth, has asserted in *p. 74.* That in the REVIEW there was but *one true and exact Quotation* out of the *Quakers Writings*. His Friends in this Town, especially *E. W.* had affirm'd the same. I had so much Charity for some of them, at first, as to suppose that they had look'd into some differing Editions of their Friends Books, till I

A

found

found out, that *E. W.* had the same Edition of *R. B.* with that from which I took my Quotations; I got a sight of his own Book, and therein turned down above twenty Pages wherein he might see that I had done *R. B.* Justice. Then he turn'd his Tale and said, that he meant others of their Friends Books. I leave that to his own Conscience. They have often affirm'd that I have fram'd those things out of my own Heart. This was so firmly believ'd by some of their own Company, that I receiv'd one Letter without a Name, which contain'd the same heavy Charge; and tho' I suppose I know from whom it came, yet because he shew'd more civility than some others have done, I will pass it over; for I believe he was impos'd upon by *E. W.* as some other young Ones have been. I wish they may consider of things more sedately afterwards, when they shall see that those Quotations were really taken out of the *Quakers* Books; and then if it wou'd have been great wickedness in me to have feigned such things out of my own Heart, let them ask themselves calmly, whether the fault can be less in their own Friends who have first asserted them.

An honest *Quaker*, whom I will not Name, lest he shou'd fall under your Displeasure, said that if those Things that I had charg'd their Friends with, were really true, they did not deserve to live. I dare not say so, his Sentence was too hasty, for I think they have the more need to live, and repent of, and change their Opinions.

ANOTHER Letter was sent to me from *Thomas Coe*, directed to *William Notcutt*, Priest, with them a Term of Reproach, bestow'd upon all Ministers but their own Brethren and Sisters. This Letter was written in the style of an angry Man, wherein appar'd an aiery, not a serious and humble Spirit; it was for the most part, in the form of a *Ballad*; without

witho
says,
and
in the
Truth
denn
ing.
he se
cond
was
Cond
thou
thy
Dog
high
save
the
the
living
Type
Dan
he
this
to
by
vils
a W
it
Spi
the
for
the
Ifr
to
tha
ba
for
th

without regard to what their great Prophet *G. F.* says, *Vial. p. 11. Ye that delight in Songs, in Tunes and Ballads, Rhimes and inventing Verses, you are in the Fables, acting in that Nature which is out of the Truth, all such Works of the Flesh are to be condemned.* In his *Rhimes* he is very liberal in charging me with *acting against my own Conscience*, thus he set himself in the Place of *God*, judging and condemning me without Mercy. Affirming that *I was in the Devil's Kingdom.* And said, *This is thy Condemnation that Light is come into the World, and thou W. N. love Darknes rather than Light, because thy Deeds are evil.* And speaking as if I were a Dog, faith, *That I bark at the Children of the most high, — and that my Doctrine is, that God will save Men in their Sins. —* And that my Spirit is the same that wrought in Sanballat; and that I, like the old cursed railing Assyrian, had blasphemed the living God. And that that Blasphemer was but a Type of me. And that I am possessed of Egyptian Darknes. He lays this heavy Charge on me, tho' he never Spoke to me, as I know of, or I to him; this looks as if he suppos'd himself to be arriv'd to that Infallibility, that *G. F.* speaks of, whereby they could discern *who are Saints, who are Devils, and who are Apostates, without speaking ever a Word.* Poor rash Man! he is much to be pitt'y'd, it may well be said to him, *he knows not what Spirit he of.* He may do well to consider whether this Fire was taken from the Altar, or from some other Place. He intimates that *I am worse then Rabshakah, who blasphemed the Lord God of Israel.* What just ground had he to compare me to that wicked Blasphemer, and to make me worse than him! for he said that *that wicked Man was but a Type of me.* One would think that his Conscience, or Light within, should smite him for these Things. But he is so far from injuring my

Name, that hereby he renders himself Contemptible to all modest and discreet Readers. A good Cause is so far from needing such putrid Stuff, that this Method alone is enough to marr a good Cause, much less will it mend a bad one. Will a wise Man judge of the Truth, by Railing or by Reason? We ever take it for granted, that the Cause is bad, or else that Reason fails, when Railing is used for Weapons to defend it. But this has been the manner of some of the chief Advocates for their Principles. *Mather's Hist. N. England* lib. 7. p. 26. Prepare, saith he, to be assaulted with such Language as Fisher the Quaker in his Pamphlets does bestow upon such Men as Dr. Owen. Thou fiery Fighter, and green-headed Trumpeter; thou Hedge-hog, and grinning Dog; thou Bastard that tumbled out of the Mouth of the Babilonish Bawd; thou Mole; thou Tinker; thou Lizzard; thou Bell of no Mettle, but the Tone of the Kettle; thou Wheel-barrow; thou Whirl-pool; thou Whirligig; O! thou Firebrand; thou Adder, and Scorpion; thou Louse; thou Cowdung; thou Moon-calf; thou ragged Tatterdemallion; thou Judas; thou livest in Philosophy and Logic, which are of the Devil. And then let Penn the Quaker add, Thou gormandizing Priest; one of the abominable Tribe; thou bane of Reason; and Beast of the Earth; thou best to be spared of Mankind; thou Mountebank Priest. These are their very Words, I wrong them not, which they vomit out against the best Men in the English Nation, that have been so hardy as to touch their Light within. Thus far Mr. Mather.

THEY charge Ministers with bewitching the People with their Sorceries; they call them Baal's Priests; Conjurers; the Pope's Ministers; Babylon's Merchants; whited Walls; ravening Wolves; ambitious Pharisees; painted Sepulchers; blind Guides; Locusts; night Batts; night Owls; dark Lanthorns; fleshly

fleshly foolish Instructors ; vomiting Nonsense with their nonsensical Noddles ; in damnable Darknss, and willful Blindness ; in obstinate Unbelief ; Children of the adulteress and imperious Whorish Woman ; insatiable Hirelings, false Prophets, dumb Dogs, blind Hypocrites, dead Beasts, dark Beasts, sottish Beasts, polluted filthy Beasts, and at enmity with all Goodness. This poyson of Asps has been found under their Lips: You may find much of this in Samuel Fisher's Works, Folio, p. 104. 218, 219. 221. 316. 509. 719. and many other Pages. Great Myst. Tit. pag. and brief Discovery of a threefold State of Antichrist, p. 7, 8, 9. which Book is recommended by five of their Leaders. E. Burr. Ret. to the Ministers of London, p. 13. and in his Works. G. Fox Reply to Vind. p. 1, 2. 7, 8. 9. and his Vials p. 9. full of it against Gentlemen.

It was no surprize to me, to find the same Spirit in *Thomas Coe*, but whether this can be the Spirit of Christ, I leave the Reader to determine. If any Gentleman has a Mind to read these Things in the *Quakers* Books, they shall be very welcome to see them ; for some may Question whether such Expressions can possible be found in their Writings. So much for that sorry Stuff.

AFTER the REVIEW was published, certain *Quakers* came to ask me two or three Questions, the chief of them was, *Whether I would stand by every Thing that I had asserted in the Review?* I answer'd that I would do so. But sometime after this I was inform'd by Men of known Probity, from *Woodbridge* and *Keldon*, that one of those Men affirm'd, that I said, *I would not stand by what I had written, and that I was sorry for it, and would do so no more ; and that I was Silent to some of their Questions ; and that they had a notable Victory over me that Evening.* Those Men know in their own Consciences that these Things are
utterly

utterly false, and that on the contrary they left the weightiest Question unanswered.

I ask'd *H. Smith*, Do you expect to be justified before God by your own Works and Merits, or by the Merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ? Which Question was put to him several Times, but he did not think fit to Answer one Word. Then I said to him, "Friend, This does not look Sincere to hide your Opinions; you speak of these things one to another, why will not you tell me which you are for; if you had ask'd me any Question of the like Nature, I wou'd have answer'd you in the plainest Words I could think of." I added, "These two are as differing as Heaven and Earth; why will not you Answer me this Question?" But he wou'd not answer me one Word to it: Those Friends that were present know this to be true. But because *H. B.* saith that I have forfeited my Credit, and am no more to be believed; those that were present when the three Quakers came to talk with me, have voluntarily set their Hands to the following Lines, and are ready to attest the same to any one that will make application to them, being Men well known in *Ipswich*.

" **W**E, whose Names are under-written, being present from first to last, when the three Quakers came to talk with Mr. *Notcutt*, and having heard all Things that pass'd on both Sides, Do declare for the Satisfaction of any that may have been imposed upon, that Mr. *Notcutt* did not hesitate, as has been reported, as not able or willing to Answer any one Question that was then put to him; neither did he say that he would not stand by what he had written; or that he was sorry for it; or wou'd do so no more; neither did he say that he had ne-

" ver

“ *ver read George Fox's Great Mystery*; These
 “ things are utterly False. And we also affirm
 “ that *H. Smith* did not Answer one Word, when
 “ several Times he was ask'd, whether he was
 “ for Justification by his own Works and Me-
 “ rits, or by the Merits of our Saviour Jesus
 “ Christ? And that *Edward Walker* said, that
 “ he did not own the Scriptures to be the Word
 “ of God. Mr. *Notcutt* said, If the Scriptures
 “ call themselves so, will you allow us to call
 “ them so? *E. Walker* answer'd, Yes. Then Mr.
 “ *Notcutt* prov'd it from Scripture. *E. Walker* was
 “ Silent, and would not give his Sense upon the
 “ Scripture; Mr. *Notcutt* gave the Sense of the
 “ Place, and so ended the Matter, without any
 “ Reply. To all which we set our Hands for
 “ the sake of the Truth, and for theirs also who
 “ may have been misinform'd.

Stephen Bedwell, sen. John Wilkinson, jun.
Matthew Stockdell. Joseph Clarke.

THE Pamphlet, intituled, *A Vindication of R. B.*
Esq. with a virulent Spirit, charges the *Review*
 with *Injustice, want of Charity, good Manners, and*
common Honesty, doing all out of *Envy and Ma-*
lice; and that by *Lies and Slander*, I have for-
 feited my *Reputation and Credit*; and am *no more*
to be believed in what I have written. This is
 a heavy Charge indeed, and were it true, I shou'd
 be one of the worst of Men upon Earth; which
 I suppose he wou'd have every one think me to
 be, that what I have written may not be regard-
 ed by the Reader. Pray observe (for I have to do
 with a captious Adversary, who is ready to carp
 at Words) I do not say that *H. B.* hath pack'd
 all these Accusations into one Place, but you will
 find them running thro' his whole Performance.
 But I determine not to return Railing for Rail-
 ing;

ing; for as our Religion forbids it, so I find no Inclination to it, but to speak forth the Words of Truth and Soberness; for as the Truth does not need such a Method, so it is far from the Spirit of Christ and of true Christians. I solemnly appeal to the searcher of Hearts, that I had no Prejudice against any one Man or Woman of the *Quakers*, in writing my former Book. I did it out of Conscience, both towards God and Man. I counted the Cost before hand, as our Lord directs us to do. I was well apprized what Clamour it wou'd occasion, for I knew very well how they had treated others, who were much better than my self. But I chose and determin'd rather to hearken to the Call of my own Conscience, than forfeit my inward Peace, by studying to avoid their Reproaches.

H. B. because he is inclin'd to blame every thing, he Complains also of my want of *Method*. *Risum teneatis amici*. Who can forbear Smiling at such an Expression from a *Quaker*, (if he was really one that wrote the Vindication) but I have thought from several Passages in the Book, that it was the Performance of some Hackney-Writer, that matters not what his Theam is, or who are his Masters, or whether the Cause be good or bad. And we think he has given us just occasion for such a Thought: because he has quoted *News-Papers* instead of the holy *Scriptures* in favour of their Opinions; as if wise Men could safely venture the concerns of their Souls upon that Religion, which the Author of a Weekly News-Paper shou'd recommend to us. If we had no better Foundation to go upon, we shou'd be very uncertain indeed as to our Faith, Worship and Practice. But as to *H. B.* Complaining of my want of *Method*; let me tell thee, Friend, that if I had not been told so, I should have vehemently

mently suspected, that thou hadst been *no Quaker*; for thy Friends know, as well as we, that they don't affect a Method, but rather a rambling Discourse. But I advise you in your next, *to take more care of Truth*, and that wou'd be more credit to the Cause, which you have undertaken to Vindicate, than your present Method of Lying and Slander.

H. B. begins his Vindication with a high Encomium of *R. Barclay*. That his Works have merited the publick Applause of divers ingenious Men; as being a consistent and masterly Performance; founded upon the Authority of the Sacred Writings of the Scriptures, and supported by the Opinion of famous Authors, both Ancient and Modern. But behold the famous Authors, that have approv'd of *R. Barclay's* Works, a weekly *News-Paper* is the first; O ridiculous! If he could have produc'd more famous Authors, why did he mention him first? I suppose because this Champion converses more with News-Papers than any diviner Writings. One would wonder where the Prudence of the whole Society was, to let such a slip as this go uncorrected. But you do well to endeavour to keep up the Credit of your Champion *Barclay*; for you never had such another, who like *Saul* was higher, by the Head and Shoulders, than the rest of his Brethren.

PAGE 4. you say, *That an attempt against so great and good a Man, can make but a mean Figure in the World.* As to the Figure that I and my Book may make in the World, I leave others to judge: I am very little concern'd about that matter, so that Truth may take Place, and God be glorified, and Souls preserv'd from fatal Delusion. I am no admirer of my own Performances, but think more meanly of them than of many other Men's. Yet I cannot but have the vanity

to think, surely, I may make as good a Figure in Writing, as your Women do in Speaking in the Church. And verily my Writings must look contemptible enough to every reasonable Creature, if they do not make as good a Figure, as the Writings of *G. Fox*, your admired Apostle. I challenge the best Man in the College of *Bethlehem* to compose more perfect Nonsense than *G. Fox* has done, in his *Great Mystery*, and many other of his Pieces, that I have by me. Had he not pretended to be *infallible*, and *divinely inspired*, and to have the same Measure of Inspiration as the Apostles had, and to understand all Languages; I should have pitied his Weakness, and pass'd it over in Silence. But what Law of God or Man makes it a Crime for me, to call upon young or old to beware of *false Prophets*, and *false Christs*. This conceited Man, had the vanity to set up for a Teacher to all the World; tho' he was not so happy, as to be furnished with common Sense; as every single Page in his *Great Mystery*, will demonstrate. I challenge the best of his Admirers, to pick me out one Page, in all that Folio, wherein I cannot shew them Impertinence, Inconsistency and Nonsense. He could not write his own Mother-Tongue, yet he affected to be thought a *learned Man*. He endeavour'd to make others believe that he understood *all Languages*. What else can be the meaning of these Words: *All Languages to me are but Dust, who was before Languages were.* Introd. to *G. F. Bat.* He could not mean that he esteem'd them no better then Dust, — because he set his Hand to a Book, which contain'd many Languages; as tho' he would have the World believe that he was the Author of that Book. But if any should say, Why might not *G. Fox*, tho' originally but a mean Mechanick, set up for a Preacher as well as Fisher-men?

I answer, That when God called *Elisba*, who was but an *Husband-man*, and *Amos* an *Herdsmen*, and the Apostles who were *Fisher-men*, he fitted them every one for the Work to which he had called them. Search in their Writings whether you can find any Inconsistency, much less such Nonsense, as you have in every Page of *G. Fox's* Books. One admired Expression of *G. Fox* is, *That Jesus Christ made the World before it was made*. I will allow him the Honour of the Original. But if God had called *G. Fox* to be a Preacher, would he not have fitted him for his Work with Gifts of the Holy Ghost? For so he fitted the Apostles for theirs, and they gave undeniable Proofs of their extraordinary Call, by their Speaking with other Tongues, and by working Miracles. But what did *G. Fox* ever do, to prove his Call and Mission from God?

W. P. R. B. and *S. F.* understood some other Languages, beside their own Mother Tongue; but they got not their Knowledge by Inspiration, as the Apostles did, but by Study in the ordinary Way. But who ever question'd *Robert Barclay's* Learning and Parts? The want of these was not the thing blam'd in him; but that he did not use them sincerely. Instances of which were given, in many Places, of the REVIEW. He saith, *That when they call Men to believe in Jesus Christ, they mean the Light within*. Again, He saith, *that Men must believe in Christ*; that's well said; but what Christ does he mean? He himself tells us in Page 180, 181. *We are mov'd of the Lord, to call all, invite all, request all, to turn to the Light in them, to mind the Light in them, and to believe in Christ as he is in them, and to mind the Light of Christ in their own Consciences*. Behold their Christ, and the Object of their Faith. Not the Christ in Heaven at the right Hand of God, but the Light within; is

this their sincere preaching of Christ? Why do they speak one thing and mean another? We justly distinguish between Christ and the Work of Christ; between the Spirit and the Works of the Spirit. And tho' some of the Quakers have said, that Christ without and Christ within, are but one and the same Christ; yet they themselves did not think so, when they persecuted *G Keith* for preaching up the Necessity of Faith in Christ *without*, as well as Faith in Christ *within*; for this they laid him in Prison, and he was forced to flee for his Life and Liberty to *England*.

AND if *R. Barclay* had verily thought that Christ in Heaven and Christ within, were indeed the very same Christ, and that it would be equally available to Men's Salvation, whether they consider the Object of their Faith to be Christ *without*, or Christ *within*; why does he and all the rest of their Leaders, direct Persons not to look to Christ in Heaven, but to turn inward, and believe in something within? We request all, saith he, to turn to the Light *in them*, and to believe in Christ as he is in them.

BUT to proceed, tho' we own that *R. Barclay* had both Learning and Natural Parts too; yet we know that unsanctified Learning and Parts, have often been the greatest Enemies to the Christian Religion; such having been used, as Instruments of Satan to fight against the Truth.

BUT for as much as you affirm that *R. Barclay's* Works are founded upon the Scriptures. I Answer, that he has done like the rest of his Friends, that is, has taken here and there a Verse out of the Scriptures, that seem'd to carry in it the *sound* of their Opinions: Yet I doubt not but I shall make it appear, that his *Wood, Hay and Stubble* will not bear the fiery Trial of the *Holy Scriptures*. I might instance in *R. Barclay's* Doctrine of Justification before God, by their own Works

Works, and the Merit of Works. A Doctrine directly contrary to the Scriptures, and particularly to a Text, which you yourself quoted in your Vindication. Eph. 2. 8, 9. *By Grace are ye Saved thro' Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God; not of Works lest any Man should boast.* But this Doctrine of Merit was much more at large asserted by *S. Filber*, another Leader and mighty Champion for the Principles of the Quakers. *Rust. ad. Acc. p. 137, to 144.* and a great many more Pages, he pleads and argues for Justification by Works; I will give you a little Specimen of his Divinity. "There are
 " good Works, *saith he*, which in different re-
 " spects are called (truly enough) both Christ's
 " and Ours; Ours as done in and by our Per-
 " sons; Christ's as done only by his Power in
 " us;" so far we agree with him, but he adds
 further, with which we cannot agree. "And by
 " these is the Justification of all, that ever were
 " or shall be justified, both *deserved* and *effected*;
 " and not by what he did without them, in
 " that *single Person* (Jesus Christ) that once *lived*
 " and *died at Jerusalem*, while the same Right-
 " teousness was and is not, by that same Power
 " of his fulfilled within themselves." p. 138. And
 again, "The same that gives the *meetness*
 " for the Kingdom, the self same Righteousness
 " of Christ, within us, wrought and imparted
 " to us, gives to us the *Right* to inherit it, and
 " not another *without us*, only *imputed*." p. 155.
 Thus he confounds the good Works, or *Works*
 of *Righteousness which we have done*, with the per-
 fect *Works*, or Righteousness of *Jesus Christ* our
 Surety. It is the Sanctification of the Spirit, that
 makes Men *meet* for Heaven; Heb. 12. 14. *Holi-*
ness, without which no Man shall see the Lord. But
 it is the Suretyship Righteousness of Christ, ap-
 prehended

prehended by Faith, that gives us the *Title* to Heaven.

I asserted, in the REVIEW, that the Leaders of the Quakers were upon a Covenant of Works, going about to establish their own *Righteousness*, in order to obtain Justification and Salvation; and is not here a full Proof of it? Yet *H. B.* denies it. But could he possibly be Ignorant of these Things; who pretended to Vindicate the Writings of these Men? Why then does he deny what has been published to the whole World? Is there no Truth in him? But *H. B.* would have the World believe, that he and his Friends are for Justification by Grace. Else why does he quote those two Texts? *All our Righteousnesses are but filthy Rags.* [They are so in the Article of Justification.] But how then can Men be justified by them? Can filthy Rags cover and adorn the Soul, in the sight of God? Can filthy Rags merit our Justification? *H. B.* also mentions these Words, *By Grace are ye Saved thro' Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God; not of Works, lest any Man should boast.* Eph. 2. 8, 9. These two, the *Grace* of God, and the *Merit* of our Works, are as contrary as Light and Darkness; if you consider them in the matter of Justification. So the Apostle *Paul* argues, If it is of *Works*, then it is not of *Grace*; and if it is of *Grace*, then it is not of *Works*. Now lest *H. B.* should say, as his Friend *T. Coe* did, tho' not without a Lie (as hundreds can Witness) that when we plead for Justification thro' the Merits and perfect Righteousness of our Saviour, alone; we shut out good Works, and publish that *God Saves Men in their Sins*; we are for good Works, as much as any Christians living, provided they are kept in their proper Places; that is, if they are put into the Article of Sanctification; and not in the Article of Justification before

before God: For there the Works of our Saviour alone must come. None can be justified before God, by an imperfect, therefore not by an inherent Righteousness. *James 3. 2. In many things we all offend.* Our Righteousness before God is obtained without our good Works, tho' not without Christ's. *Rom. 3. 10. By the Works of the Law, shall no Flesh living be justified.* *Gal. 2. 16. Knowing that a Man is not justified by the Works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ.* All the Works that Men do before Faith, have the Nature of Sin in them; therefore cannot merit Justification and Life. The Righteousness, by which Men are justified before God, is the Righteousness of one Man, not of many; or wrought out by every individual Man that is justified; a Righteousness of one for many, *By the Righteousness of one, shall many be justified.*

IT is a Righteousness, not obtain'd by us thro' Works, but by Faith. *It is unto all, and upon all them that believe:* And upon them by Imputation, *Rom. 4. 24.* But Sanctification is Righteousness imparted. It is the Restoration of the Image of God, on the Soul, which Men lost by the Fall; consisting in true Holiness. Now, had these Men spoken of our Justification before Men, or of the Justification of our Faith, as St. James does; then we had not opposed them; but when they assert, that the Justification of our Persons before God, is by our good Works; This we, with the Scriptures, utterly deny; and on the contrary affirm, that the Justification of our Persons, before God, can be only thro' the Merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ; *not by Works of Righteousness, which we have done;* tho' wrought by the Assistance of the Spirit of Grace and Holiness.

BUT, if R. Barclay and S. Fisher could merit by their good Works, in the Sight of God, it is no wonder that R. Barclay, by his Writings, has merited

merited the applause of some ingenious Gentlemen. But, behold! here are Men that excelled *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, and Friend of God; 'for that great, good Man, tho' strong in Faith, and his good Works must be supposed to bear some Proportion to his Faith, yet *he had nothing, whereof to glory, before God*, Rom. 4. 2. But, it seems, *R. Barclay* and *S. Filber* think they have, and they teach their Followers so too. Surely, this shews them to be wretchedly Ignorant of the Spirituality and large Extent of the holy Law of God, of their own Hearts, and of the Gospel too; while they, like the Pharisees, being Ignorant of God's Righteousness, go about to establish their own, and submit not to the Righteousness of God.

H. B. says, that I have endeavour'd to lessen the Reputation of *R. Barclay*, that I might make an Addition to my own. Whether this Charge is true or not, I leave to the Judgment of the Reader. But in the mean while, I hope he himself, will think of those Words. Rom. 2. 1. *Therefore thou art inexcusable, O Man, whoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself: For thou that judgest dost the same things; and thinkest thou this, O Man, that dost the same, that thou shalt escape the Judgment of God?* But I find, that when Arguments fail, he betakes himself to his common Artillery, and carnal Weapons of Slander; thereby to raise the Dust, that he may blind the Eyes of the Simple. We have heard a great deal of these Reflections, from your Friends, ever since the REVIEW was published. I do not so much heed the Anger and Reflections of some very busy Men, of your Party, whose Conversation is no Credit to their Profession. I never care to talk with Men about Religion, till they shall first reform their
Lives.

Lives. I do not mention Names, upon such an Occasion, for my design is not to expose Men, but to reform them in Doctrine and Conversation, I will only add, that God will say to such officious Praters ; as he has done to Men of like Spirit and Practice. Psal. 50. 16. *Unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to take my Covenant into thy Mouth, seeing thou hatest Instruction, and castest my Words behind thee.* It is little matter what Religion such Men are of ; for, in Truth, they are of no Religion at all ; but are a Disgrace and Scandal to what they profess ; and a Grief to better Men of the same Sect.

Mr. Norris is also produced, as one that approves of *R. Barclay's* Apology, in these Words, " I cannot think *Quakerism* so inconsiderable, as the Principles of it are laid down and managed by Mr. Barclay ; the great and general Contempt they lie under, does not hinder me, from thinking the Sect of the *Quakers* to be by far the most considerable of any that divide from the Church." The Sense of Mr. Norris seems to be this, that if *R. Barclay* has given a true Account of the Principles of the generality of the *Quakers*, then the *Quakers* Principles cannot be so Contemptible as they are commonly thought to be. But by his manner of Expression, it appears to me, that he question'd, whether *R. Barclay* had given a true Account of their Principles ; besides Mr. Norris seems to be little acquainted with their Writings, or else he would not have put in this Expression, *In case the Quakerism, that is generally held, be the same with that which Mr. Barclay has delivered to the World as such.* But this is what I have fully made out, in the REVIEW, that *R. Barclay* in his Apology, has not fairly laid down the Principles of the generality of the *Quakers* : For many of
C their

their Leaders have written directly contrary to what he has laid down, in his pretended Apology: Therefore, what Mr. Norris has said in their Favour, makes nothing to the Credit of R. Barclay, or of their Principles.

H. B. saith, "That R. Barclay was one of the "greatest Wits of the Age." Suppose this to be true, I don't reckon it any necessary Qualification of a Minister, or one that pretends to write Divinity, to be a great Wit in the Sense he intends it; if he had been a Poet indeed, it might have been a needful Qualification. But I think that a good and honest Heart, Grace and a good Conversation, together with a competent Measure of human Learning, are more necessary Qualifications for a Minister. But when all is done, we judge of Principles in Religion, neither by the Wit of the Author; nor by a News-Paper; nor by the Judgment of one Divine, tho' never so great and good; but by the holy Scriptures. Isa. 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no Light in them.*

H. B. in p. 7. referring to p. 5. of the REVIEW, first falsly Prints my Words, and then goes on to fight against his own Mistake. He Prints my Words thus, "R. Barclay has not been so honest "as to shew wherein many of their approved "Writers have differ'd from himself, and that "he did not pretend to Vindicate or make Apology for all that has been written by any Man "or Men that have gone before him, by the "Name of Quakers." And then he goes on to make Remarks upon it, as tho' those had been my Words. Whereas my Words were these, "There "is one Book, which he has lent to young People, written by R. Barclay, who has attempted "to make the Principles of the Quakers to look "as

" as agreeable to the Word of God, as possibly
 " he could. In his Title Page, and in some o-
 " ther Places of his Book, he has asserted, that
 " he has vindicated, or made Apology for the Prin-
 " ciples of the *Quakers*; but he has no where
 " been so honest as to shew wherein many o-
 " thers, of their approved Writers, have differ-
 " ed from himself. If he had said, I am a *Qua-*
 " *ker*, and the Doctrines in my Book I own and
 " will stand by, but I pretend not to Vindicate
 " or make Apology for all that has been writ-
 " ten by any Man or Men that have gone be-
 " fore me, or have written in my Time by the
 " Name of *Quakers*, then the World would have
 " thought him an honest Man." These are my
 Words. *H. B.* affirms, " That I would have put
 " *R. Barclay* upon the hard Task of Vindicating
 " all that ever had been written under the Name
 " of *Quakers*, or would make him accountable
 " for the Writings of every other Man, that has
 " written as a *Quaker*." Where was the Man's
 Light at this Time? Is not this a wilful Mi-
 stake? There was no occasion given him for such
 an Interpretation, but quite the Contrary. I was
 so far from putting *R. Barclay* upon that Task
 of making Apology for every one, that I *blam'd*
 him for pretending to justify them all, without
 any Exception. And this will appear to any one
 that will read those very Words that *H. B.* quar-
 rels with in Page 5. of the REVIEW. This is
 a most unjust and groundless Charge, whether de-
 sign'd, or done out of Ignorance, I will not de-
 termine.

BUT *H. B.* goes on to argue most ridiculously
 and impertinently from his own Fiction, and false
 Printing my Words, that my Sense must be this:
That if R. Barclay would not Answer for all that
the Quakers had written, he could not be Honest.

Poor Man, I pity thy Weakness. My Argument was plainly this, That whereas *R. Barclay* had taken upon *himself* the very hard Task of vindicating the Principles of the *Quakers*, without any Exception, and yet had not taken the least Notice of any one, of the many vile Expressions, written by some of their Leaders; but on the contrary, pretended that his Book contain'd a full and true Account of their Principles in general; this I said does not seem Honest; and I see not how the Argument can be excepted against.

BUT *H. B.* having stumbled and fallen at the Block of his own laying, cannot get up again; but proceeds to argue, like one in a Dream, that *R. Barclay is not accountable for any Expressions that private Persons have spoken.* But by his Leave, if *R. Barclay* undertook to do it, and made the World believe so, by his Title Page, then by setting himself in the Place of an Advocate, he was obliged to answer for them. It is but a *Sham* for *H. B.* to call such by the Name of *private Persons*, who have often appear'd in Print, and published their Names, with their Principles, to the World; and Persons too that pretend to be inspired. To call these *private Persons*, is to impose upon the Reader; as if what the REVIEW had quoted, was only spoken by an obscure Man or Woman; whereas I took the most of my Quotations out of the Books of their *Chief Leaders*. What do you call *S. Fisher*, *G. Whithead*, *W. Penn*, *E. Burrough*, and *G. Fox*, by the Name of *private Men*? For these were the Men that I quoted in the REVIEW. These very Men were their chief Speakers, and Writers; these were their Counsellors; these their Treasurers, Champions and Advocates, their principal Secretaries and Spiritual Guides. Now I appeal to any honest

nest *Quaker*, whether these Men were reckon'd as private Persons among them. No verily, these Men and their Writings were as much known among them as *R. Barclay* was.

H. B. I must tell thee, that this was but a trick, thou wast in the carnal, and I cannot but think that the Spirit of some of thy Friends must testify against thee.

BUT Page 8. — He intimates that we do not think our selves accountable for the blasphemous Doctrine of Election asserted by *Elisba Cole*. That no Society is accountable for Expressions of any single Man, unless the Principles are allow'd by that Society. This is but a crafty way to shift off the Charge of any false Doctrine, justly chargeable upon the *Quakers*. Must I reckon you a publick or private Man? For you have set only two Letters, *H. B.* in the Title Page; will your Society be accountable for all your Untruths in the Vindication? Or will they call you a private Man, and so wipe off the Score at once? But *Elisba Cole's* Name was brought in, for the sake of his absurd, uncharitable, and blasphemous Doctrine of Election. To which I answer, that I gave you no occasion for that flirt; but I am not going about either to justify or condemn that Doctrine, both being foreign to our present Purpose. The only Observation that I make upon it, is this; that you and your Friends will do well to consult, how to Answer an Adversary that might ask you, whether you verily believe that *E. Burrough* and *G. Fox* were divinely inspired, when they have published this Absurd, Uncharitable and Blasphemous Doctrine. *E. Burrough* in his Preface to *Great Mystery*, saith, *The Elect is risen among us, which you cannot deceive; we are of the Royal Seed, Elect, chosen and faithful.* *G. Fox Gr. Myst. p. 213. The Church is the People of God, the Elect Seed,*

Seed, which Christ is the Head of. Page 258, *But the Elect he cannot deceive; the Elect hath the Victory and Dominion; which were elected in him before the Foundation of the World; Glory for ever.* Page 260 When one of G. Fox's Adversaries asserted, "That none can give a Reason of Election, or know the Elect of God." He answers, *And so he is out of the Apostles Doctrine, who said they were elected before the Foundation of the World.* And, p. 325. *Who knows the Seed, knows the Election, before the World was made.* Now will you call E. Burrough and G. Fox private Men, and wipe these Blasphemies off that way? Or will you blot out these Expressions in the next Impression of their Books, as you have done some other things? If you choose the latter, how will you answer such as may question their Infallibility and your Faith about it. I know it is a Dilemma; but you have more Ways to the Wood than one. If I shall have Opportunity to talk with your Friends again, I shall ask a few Questions of this Nature; I hope they will not Answer me with Silence, as your Friend Smith did; if so, I shall not look on them as the wiser or honestest for hiding their Notions.

H. B. goes on with his heavy Charge against the Author of the REVIEW, and saith, p. 9. "That to carry on his Resentment, he saith, That R. Barclay said not a Word of their Blasphemy against Christ and his Word." And it is very true, and I Challenge him, or any Man, to produce any such thing where R. Barclay has ingenuously acknowledged any one of the Blasphemies of his Friends. Yet H. B. saith, "This I must beg leave to say, is a high Abuse, and looks to me, as if he did not value what he said, so that he could answer his End, of effectually prejudicing People against the Quakers in general"

“ neral, and *R. Barclay* in particular. But, *saith*
 “ *he*, will Men of Judgment receive so dogma-
 “ tical an Assertion without Proof? Surely no.”
 And I say so too, Surely no; neither need they
 to do it; for I have fully prov’d it, in many
 Branches, which it seems you cannot bear the
 Light of.

When I said that *R. Barclay* had not so much
 as mention’d any of the Blasphemies of his Friends,
 much less had he made Apology for any of them,
 as he gave us to expect. *H. B.* calls this a *high*
abuse of *R. Barclay*; whereas it is *plain Truth*,
 and he cannot give me one Instance in all *R.*
Barclay’s Book, wherein he has so much as men-
 tion’d any of the Blasphemies of his Friends.
 But he saith, *That it looks as if I did not value*
what I said. If he could have prov’d it to be
 an Untruth, why did he not give one Instance?
 But because he only crys out of the *Abuse*, and
 does not endeavour to shew it to be so, I con-
 clude he cannot; and therefore the Charge stands
 good against him; and I Challenge him to shew
 me wherein I have wronged him. And if he
 cannot, his own Words will turn upon himself,
that it looks as if he did not value what he said.

CHAP. I.

Of the Rise of the Quakers.

AS for *H. B’s* multiplying of Scriptures to
 shew that there were *Quakers* in the Pri-
 mitive Times, I do not wonder at it, it has
 been the way of that People, all along, to claim
 the Prophets, the Apostles, and all the Saints
 and

and Martyrs, Fathers and Reformers, to be every one of them *Quakers*. This is ridiculous, and betrays their Ignorance of all History. But what I have said upon that Head, in the REVIEW, he hath not thought good to Answer, nor will he ever be able to answer it, to any Man in his Senses. Some of the *Quakers* have told us the very Time of the Rise of their Sect. *William Caton, Moderate Enquirer*, printed 1671, p. 3. saith, *They were raised up about eight or nine Yeors ago, and since the Year 1652, they have much multiply'd and increas'd.* That many good People, in the Primitive Times, upon particular and extraordinary Occasions, did tremble and quake, no Body denies; neither is that the Question in Debate between them and us. But nothing is more manifest than that those Persons, spoken of in Scripture, were not of the *Quakers* Principles. *Moses* could not be a Quaker; for no Man living shew'd more Respect to the *Ordinances* of God than he, which the Quakers do not, they are above them. *Daniel* could not be a Quaker, for he *prayed* in his House three Times a Day, and *confess'd his own Sins*, as well as the Sins of the People; an Exercise little known among the Quakers; nor indeed is it consistent with their Dream of Perfection. And *Paul* could not be a Quaker, for he was not only *baptized* himself, but he *baptized* others; besides he forbad *Women speaking* in the Church; moreover he charged upon the Churches, the Observation of the *Lord's Supper*, and himself practis'd the same. And the *Jaylor* could not be a Quaker, for he and all his House were *baptized*; which Ordinance the Quakers utterly disown, and call it a *carnal Ordinance*, and say that it came from the Pope. *Smith's Primmer*, p. 36. Page 12. *H. B.* says, *That now it appears that there were People that trembled in former Ages.* I Answer, That

That has been granted, but what is that to his Purpose? which was to prove that those Tremblers were of the *same Principles* with the Quakers. Had he shew'd this, then he had done something, but now he has brought several Scriptures to prove what was granted him, even before he brought them. But he adds, I see no Reason why they [*Moses, Daniel, &c*] should not be called Quakers. And so he trifles on, and saith, *W. Notcutt* himself must needs be a Quaker too. And I believe I am, as much as *Moses* and *Daniel* were. But he thinks he has shewn a marvelous Piece of Learning, in forming a Syllogism. But, Friend, do you consider what you are doing? How comes it about that you go to *Hell*, to beat up for Forces against us? For, you know, that some of your Leaders have said, that Philosophy and Logick are of the *Devil*.

BUT let that pass; his Syllogism stands thus; *W. Notcutt Works out his Salvation with Fear and Trembling, therefore W. Notcutt is a Quaker*. It is pity that I am forc'd to say of his only Syllogism, that it is false, and not reducible to any just Rules of Logick. But *H. B.* saith, he thinks *there is no way to evade his Conclusion*, that is, that he has undenyably prov'd me to be a Quaker. But I think, upon surer Grounds, I can much easier prove many of your Leaders to be no true Christians.

AND now you shall see how easily and honestly I can Answer your false Syllogism thus. If *W. Notcutt* holds all the fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion, then *W. Notcutt* is no Quaker; but *W. Notcutt* holds all the fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion; *Ergo*. Or thus, if *W. Notcutt* differs from the Quakers in most or all the fundamental Doctrines of Religion, then *W. Notcutt* is no Quaker, but *W. Not-*

cult differs from the Quakers in most or all the fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion. *Ergo.*

Page 13. *H. B.* endeavours to wipe *J. Naylor* clean from his Blasphemy, by charging it upon his imprudent Followers; tho' he acknowledges "that *J. Naylor* might not reprove them as he ought to have done." This is but a poor Excuse: For they did this thro' a great part of the City. If it had been done by one Man, or but once utter'd, there might have been much said in his Favour; but this is a fallacy, and makes a bad Cause worse; for *J. Naylor* might quickly have stop'd them, if he had dislik'd what they said and did; even as *Paul* and *Barnabas* did, when the Idolaters call'd them Gods, and would have offer'd Sacrifices to them; it is said, *They ran in among them, and said, Sirs, why do ye these things? We are Men of like Passions with your selves, and preach to you, that ye should turn from these dumb Idols.* But *J. Naylor* let them go on in their blasphemous Acclamations, and bowing the Knee before him: And these were not the common Mobb, but his own Disciples that were with him Day and Night. And he himself at his Tryal justified what they had said and done to him: So that he was as deep in the Dirt as his Disciples were in the Mire. His Disciples said that his Name was changed from *James* to *Jesus*; and that he was the only begotten Son of God; and that they knew no other Saviour but him. *Foot yet in the Snare.* p. 14. 1656. *J. Naylor* own'd and justified the same, in Terms Equivalent. And *G. Fox* was not far from this Errour, when he said, *That God's Christ is not distinct from his Saints.* Great Mystery, p. 207. But *H. B.* takes it ill, that I made this Remark upon it: *Thus their Beginning was with Blasphemy.*
He

He says that this Conclusion is very unfair. To which I reply, that it is a natural and honest Conclusion: For the Case stands thus, *If James Naylor and his Disciples were some of the first of the Sect of the Quakers, and were both guilty of Blasphemy, then their Beginning was with Blasphemy; but the former is true, therefore the latter.* Then why does *H. B.* complain of Injustice done them? But this is the common Clamour of the Advocates for your Principles, when Arguments fail. If any write against them, they cry out, "That they are abus'd, and treated unjustly; that they are bely'd both in Story and Quotations; that they are misrepresented, and their Expressions perverted." Now, I must do you the Justice, to acknowledge, that whatever your own Principles or Practice may be; you have thoroughly learnt this Part of your Lesson, and are not wanting to use these Weapons, when other Artillery fails.

If their Adversary does but miss a Figure, or transpose one, or leave out, or put in a Word, in a Quotation, tho' he never injures the Sense by it, but designs to make better *English* of it; they presently make such an Out-cry, as if it was done out of *Malice*, and on purpose to injure them. And sometimes this is all you shall have from them, instead of an Answer, to blind or amuse the Reader. Sometimes they are Silent; and that's better than Falshood; which if I have not Reason enough to charge upon this Author, I am willing to bear the severest Censure of the impartial Reader.

PAGE 16, 17. *H. B.* is very angry that I asserted, "That *G. Fox* said that he was Christ." And with much Warmth, he saith, *With what Front can the Reviewer stand up in the Face of the Country, and assert, that this very Man gave out*

that he was the Christ? To which I answer, with what Front could *G. Fox* assert it? And with what Front can *H. B.* deny it? when it has been fairly prov'd by others, and the *Quakers* know it. Can you pretend to plead their Cause, and be a Stranger to these things? Say whether your Ignorance or something worse must account for this. But you put me upon the Proof, and I am ready to do it. *G. Fox* speaks of himself as the very Christ, in these Words: *In the Presence of the Lord God, I do declare, as God is my Witness, by whom I give this forth from him, whom the World calls George Fox, who is the Son of God.* And that he does not speak of himself as a Son of God by Adoption, is evident from his next Words, which are these: *My Kingdom is not of this World.* Snake in the Grass, p. 113, 114. Others also gave him divine Honour and Adoration, and call'd him *the Branch*, and *the Star of Righteousness*: Terms given to Christ in Scripture. *New Rome Arr.* p. 33, 34.

Josiah Cole sent a most blasphemous Letter to *G. Fox*, which being complain'd of, by one that wrote against them; *W. Penn* undertook to Vindicate the Expressions. *Jud. and the Jews*, p. 44. The Letter runs thus; *Dear G. Fox, who art the Father of many Nations; whose Life hath reach'd thro' us, thy Children, to the Lands afar off, to the begetting again, many to a lively Hope; for which Generations to come shall call thee blessed; whose Habitation is in the Power of the Highest, in which thou rules and governest in Righteousness, and thy Kingdom is established in Peace, and the Increase thereof is without End.* *H. B.* cannot say truly, that I have fram'd these things out of my own Heart, for the *Quakers* have thought good to own and justify these Expressions. And a great Speaker amongst them used the same Language.

Qu. C
indee
Worl
Worl
true
shalt
Mill
yet b
any
that
those
the
self
Chri
calls
there
that
our
nour
a v
like
some
Pow
at l
bitio
T
Boo
ed
of L
Ner
ten
Na
Nor
filp
of
Fo
so
to

Qu. Chal. p. 6. speaking of *G. Fox*, saith, *A Prophet indeed, it was said of Christ, that he was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not; so it may be said of this true Prophet, whom John said he was not; but thou shalt feel this Prophet one Day, as heavy as a Millstone upon thee, and tho' the World knows him not, yet he is known.* From whence I argue, that if any Man will take unto himself the *Royal Titles* that belong to the *King of England*, and receive those *Titles* from others, that Man calls himself the *King of England*; so he that takes upon himself the *Royal Titles* that belong alone to *Jesus Christ*, and receives them from others, that Man calls himself *Christ*. This *G. Fox* has done; therefore he has not been abused by me. I wish that these Men were as tender of the Honour of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, as they are of the Honour of *G. Fox*, who appears to me, to be under a very strong Temptation of *Pride*, something like *Simon Magus*, giving out that himself was some great Man; or that he was the mighty Power of God. But as *Simon's Hypocrisy* was at last discovered, so will *G. Fox's Pride and Ambition*.

THIS Man pretended to be the Author of a Book containing about thirty Languages. Printed 1659. and Sign'd, Page 10. *I who am the Prince of Life.* Is not that calling himself *Christ*? Again, *News coming out of the North. Tit. p. 1655. Written from the Mouth of the Lord, from one whose Name is not known in the World, risen out of the North, which was prophesied of, but now is fulfilled.* It is the same which *Jesus Christ* speaks of himself: And was not applicable to *G. Fox*: For there was not one of an hundred that was so much known in the World as he was. And to say that he was prophesied of; where is he spoken

ken of by the Prophets? Is not this to put himself in the Place of Christ?

BUT to close this Head, and make the Matter yet more plain; you Challenge me to prove that *G. Fox* ever said, in plain Words, that he was Christ. I take this to be impertinent, for this very thing has been done already by others; and the Quakers have Seen and Read it; then why would you have me to publish it again? But lest you should say that I have taken this also out of my own Heart, you shall once more have it, as it stands. *Snake in the Grass*, p. 19, 20. "I will now
" prove my Charge against them, even in legal
" Form, by Evidences upon Oath, which you
" will find in a Book printed 1653. intituled,
" *A brief Relation of the Religion of the Modern*
" *Quakers*. p. 2, 3. That *G. Fox* affirm'd several
" Times, before several Justices of the Peace,
" that he was *Equal with God*. This was at-
" tested both before the Justices, and Judge at
" the Assizes. And that *G. Fox* had avow'd him-
" self to be *the Christ*, the Way, the Truth and
" the Life. This was witnessed by *George Bickett*
" and *Isaac Bourn*. And that *G. Fox* had said,
" that he was the *Judge of the World*. This
" was witnessed by *George Bickett*, *Adam Sands*,
" and *Nath. Atkinson*. Moreover *Mr. Sawro*, a
" Justice of the Peace, told the Judge, in open
" Court, that he could produce many more, who
" could witness, that *G. Fox* had affirm'd himself
" to be *the Christ*."

Now, you have the Proof that you call'd for: And will you say any more, *With what Front can the Reviewer stand up, in the Face of the Country, and assert, that this very Man [G. Fox] gave out that he was Christ?* Now I appeal to the Reader whether I have not made good my Charge; and freed my self from his unjust Imputation of Fraud
and

and
ter,
good.
Bu
G. F
thing
Answ
at th
" th
" an
" po
" th
" or
mitte
the l
Here
ready
think
the
next
but
by t
Rotta
falle
pressi
thro
are p
and
press
most
first.
your
phen

and Lies. I had not said a Word of this Matter, if *H. B.* had not challeng'd me to make it good.

BUT if any should say, those Evidences were *G. Fox's* Enemies ; and it is not fair to urge these things, as if *G. Fox* had written the Words himself. Answer, so might it be pleaded by a Criminal at the Bar ; " My Lord, I confess that what " these have witnessed upon Oath, is very plain ; " and their Depositions also agree ; but these De- " ponents should be consider'd as my Enemies, " they attempt to take away my good Name, " or my Life." If such a Plea shou'd be admitted in Court, to set aside the Evidences for the King, few Malefactors would be convicted. Here are three agreeing Witnesses, and more were ready to witness the same. And now do you think that this is all that I have to do, to prove the Fact, when you bid me ? No, verily, I must next observe, that whereas there were originally but *two principal Pillars* of the Quakers Principles, by this you see that both of them prov'd to be *Rotten Pillars* ; both of them *false Prophets* and *false Christs*. And tho' the *Habits* and some *Expressions* of the Modern Quakers may be alter'd, thro' Policy ; yet the Books of these very Men are preserved, re-printed, and spread among them ; and tho' they have alter'd and left out some *Expressions*, yet the Modern Quakers are, for the most part, of the very same Principles with the first. Let me advise you, henceforth, to endeavour to amend, and not to smother your blasphemous Expressions.

C H A P. II.

Of the Holy Scriptures.

IN Page 22. *H. B.* affirms, " That they do
 " not flight the Scriptures, to whose Authority
 " they appeal, for the Probation of their known
 " *Principles.*" And then quotes a Passage out of
R. Barclay. " It doth appear at what an high
 " Rate we value them [the Scriptures ;] account-
 " ing them, without Deceit, or Equivocation, the
 " most excellent Writings in the World ; to which
 " not only no other Writings are to be preferr-
 " ed, but in divers Respects, not comparable
 " thereto." And again, " We do acknowledge
 " the Scriptures to be a very heavenly and di-
 " vine Writing, the Use of them to be very com-
 " fortable and necessary to the Church of Christ.
 " And we also give Praise to the Lord for his
 " wonderful Providence, in preserving these Writ-
 " ings so pure, and uncorrupted. We look up-
 " on them as the only fit outward Judge of Con-
 " troversies among Christians ; and that whatso-
 " ever Doctrine is contrary to their Testimony,
 " may therefore be utterly rejected as false ; and
 " for our Part, we are willing, that all our Do-
 " ctrines and Practices be try'd by them, which
 " we never refused, nor ever shall, in Contro-
 " versies with our Adversaries, as the Judge and
 " Test ; we shall also be very willing to admit it, as
 " a positive, certain Maxim, that whatsoever any
 " do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary
 " to the Scriptures, be accounted and reckon'd
 " a Delusion of the Devil."

These

THESE are great Sayings indeed ; and what Soul that knows their Books and Principles no better, would not be captivated by these good Expressions, to entertain a most favourable Opinion of them ; but to these things I must say, as Mr. Norris did, that if the Quakers Principles were such as R. Barclay has laid them down, they are not worthy of that general Contempt, that they lie under. But this is what I all along blam'd R. Barclay for. That he has asserted, that he has truly stated and made Apology for the Principles of the Quakers in general, when it is utterly false ; he has deceiv'd his Reader. And so he has done even in the last Paragraph concerning the Scriptures, for therein he has not spoken the Mind and Judgment of many of their chief Leaders.

1. He saith, "*They don't slight the Scriptures.*" But don't they do so that speak lightly of them ? who call them a dead Letter, Dung, Dust and Serpent's Meat. *Gr. Myst.* p. 45, 46. And S. Fisher speaks of the Scriptures as *wrong, doubtful and fallible*, p. 542. And p. 547. *The dead Letter, liable to be alter'd, corrupted, nullified, uncertain, most uncertain, liable to be mistranslated, misinterpreted, mistranscribed, wrested, molder away, to perish, to be torn in pieces, burnt, and many ways brought to nothing.* Judge now, good Reader, whether they do not slight the Scriptures ; or whether, in their Hearts, these can honour them. What S. Fisher has here said of the Scriptures, can be true only of the *Paper and Ink*, in which the Mind of God is written. And what if the Paper and Ink may perish, yet *the Matter* of the Scriptures, which is the Word of God, and our Rule, is firmer and more durable than the Heavens. *Mat. 24. 35. Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but my Word shall not pass away.*

2. He saith, "That they appeal to the Authority of the Scriptures for the Probation of their known Doctrines." I must tell you, that that's but a doubtful Expression. *Their known Doctrines!* May we gather from thence, that they have some *Unknown*, or *private* Doctrines; such Mysteries as they are careful to conceal from the Knowledge of the World? The Reason of this Question is, because *H. Smith* would not tell me, whether a Man must expect to be justfy'd by the Merits of Christ, or by his own. Whatever the Judgment of the Society of the Quakers may be in this Matter, *H. Smith* acted as tho' this was one of *their hidden Doctrines*. Others have said, That the *Scriptures* must be try'd by their *Spirit*, and not the *Spirits* by the *Scriptures*. And that the *Light within* is the only Standard to try all *Doctrines* and *Spirits* by. *Great Myst. That which try's the Apostles is the Light*, p. 42. Then their Standard is as variable as their Judgments. Some that are now Quakers were once of a very differing Opinion in *Doctrines* and manner of *Worship*: What was it that led them to be of the former Perswasion, and what leades them now to be of differing Opinions, did they not follow the *Light* before? If not, then they were not sincere with God; and if so, what Assurance can we have, that they are so now? But if they did follow the *Light* before, then their Rule is fallible and uncertain, and leaves room to question whether they are yet right or no. If the *Light within* be a Standard, it can be so but to one single Person; and the Standard in one Man, differs from the Standard in another: And then, there must be as many Standards, as there are Quakers in the World. *R. Barclay* had a Standard that told him, that Men are saved by *Works*, and by the *Merit of Works*; and *S. Fisher* match'd to this Standard.

But

But you have a Standard that tells you (if you quote the Words of Scripture, without Deceit,) that we are *saved by Grace*. Both these cannot be true. Now tell us, must you come to *R. Barclay's* Standard? or he to yours? I know not how counterfeit Gold should be discerned from true, but by bringing it to the Standard: So counterfeit Grace, or false Doctrines cannot be discerned from true, unless we try them by the Scriptures. If any Man comes with a Pretence of Inspiration, and delivers certain Doctrines, that others think are not right, how must his Spirit, or Doctrines be try'd? *S. Fisher* says, p. 541. "It is the Spirit and Light, and not the Letter, by which Doctrines, Spirits, Prophets, true or false, are to be try'd. The Rule or Canon is the Light, or Word within, and not the Scriptures; the Light within is the Tryer of its self, and of the Spirits." With much more to the same purpose, p. 446. 451. 459. 547. This is most ridiculous, to try any one Man's Spirit by its self. If I suspect that a piece of Gold is too light, must I try it by its self? What will that discover? Or if I Question whether any one is a Lyar, or a Thief; must I take the Man's own Word? What Man of a thousand who is now in a fatal Errour, but will maintain his Notion, if his own Spirit must try whether he is right or wrong. By the same Rule *R. Barclay* and *S. Fisher* are right, who assert Justification by Works; and you also must needs be right, who assert Salvation by Grace; and the Reason is plain, because the Spirit is the Tryer of its self. And *R. Barclay's* Spirit tells him, that he is right; and *H. B's* Spirit tells him that he is right. So that however Men differ in Doctrines, they are certainly right, if their Spirit within them tells them so. Contrary to all this, the Spirit of God tells

us, 1 *John* 4. 1. that we must try the Spirits, and how must this be done? but the same way that the Noble Bereans try'd the Apostles Doctrines, that is by the Scriptures. *Acts* 17. 11. *They searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.* And they were commended by the Spirit of God, for so doing; then surely it is as commendable in us to do so too. If any Man must be try'd by the Light within himself, then no Man will be in the wrong; for, *every Man is right in his own Eyes*, *Pro.* 21. 2. Or, if one Man's Spirit must be try'd by another, how can I be sure that he is not liable to mistake, as well as I? And suppose these two should agree in their Opinions, yet this tryal is but like weighing two Pieces of Gold, one against another; tho' these may be found of equal weight, yet both may be too light: Or if these two do not agree, that will shew that one is wrong; but does not prove the other to be right. And if another Man's Spirit may be a Standard to me, who shall be a Standard to him? Thus we can come to no certainty, 'till every one shall come to the Standard of the Scriptures. *Ila.* 8. 20. *To the Law, and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to this Word, there is no Light in them.*

3. *R. Barclay* says, *That without Deceit, or Equivocation, they count the Scriptures, the best Writings in the World.* But I suspect there is Deceit and Equivocation in this Matter; for, it is manifest, that they except their own Writings, which are in the World. When they say that the Scriptures are the best Writings in the World; they except the Quakers Writings; else they contradict each other: For they have said, *That the Writings of their Friends, are of as great Authority as the Scriptures, and greater.* Therefore that Expression of *R. Barclay* cannot be without Deceit and Equivocation.

quivocation. And so we must Understand him; when he adds, *To which no other Writings are comparable.* He must mean no other Writings but the Quakers, or else he directly contradicts *E. Burroughs, G. Fox, and G. Whitehead. Ser. Apol. p. 49.*

4. He adds, *We account the Scriptures, to be a very heavenly and divine Writing.* This directly crosses the Spirit of *G. Fox*, who saith, *That the Scriptures are not Divine, but Human. Gr. Myst. p. 302.* III. *The Letter, Scripture, Paper and Ink, we cannot say is Spiritual, p. 78. The Letters are Carnal.*

5. He says, *We acknowledge the Scriptures to be very comfortable and necessary to the Church of Christ.* Others of their Friends have said, *That the Scriptures are not necessary.* And that a Man may know Christ, and be saved without them. *G. Fox. Them that never heard the Scriptures outwardly, the Light that every Man hath, that cometh into the World, being turned to it, with that they will see Christ, with that they will know Scripture, with that they will be led out of all Delusion; come into Covenant with God; with which they will come to worship God in the Spirit, and serve him. Great Myst. p. 168.*

6. *R. Barclay* adds, *That they give Praise to God for his wonderful Providence, for preserving the Scriptures so pure and uncorrupted.* This can hardly be without *Deceit and Equivocation*; for this very Man attempts to shew in many Pages, *that the Scriptures are corrupted*; and therefore are now a doubtful and uncertain Rule. Can *R. Barclay* give Praise to God for what he thinks they have not? I doubt that *R. Barclay* has but few Witnesses as to this particular, in the Consciences even of his own Friends.

7. He says, *Whatsoever Doctrine is contrary to this Testimony, may therefore be utterly rejected as false.*

false. Then what will become of *Women's Speaking* in the Church? For that is a **Doctrine** and **Practice**, directly contrary to the *Testimony* of the *Scriptures*. And what will become of a great **Part** of their *Friends Writings*? which in many things speak as contrary to the *Scriptures* as **Darkness** is to **Light**: Therefore, according to *R. Barclay*, these are to be rejected as *false*.

8. Once more, p. 35. he says, *Whatsoever any speak or do pretending to the Spirit which is contrary to the Scriptures, shall be reckon'd a Delusion of the Devil.* Then much of *S. Fisher* and *G. Fox*, is, according to their own **Confession**, a **Delusion** of the **Devil**. That Sentence is their own, and not ours; I wish they may beware of it.

Now, tho' we should allow that many of the **Quakers** have an high **Esteem** for the *Scriptures*, yet *R. Barclay* has not made it good, as to himself; for he has acted as the **Betrayer** of **Christ**, who said, *Hail Master, and kissed him*, and then betray'd him into the **Hands** of the **Enemy**: So has *R. Barclay* done by the *Scriptures*: in one **Place** he speaks honourably of them, and in other **Places** he has spoken many things to lessen the **Authority** and **Usefulness** of the *Scriptures*; representing them as *corrupted, doubtful and uncertain*; both as to the *Original* and our *Translation*. Thus he **Compliments** the *Scriptures*, as *Joah* did *Amasa*, that his evil **Design** might not be suspected, and then *smote him under the fifth Ribb*.

AFTER this *H. B.* quotes a **Passage** out of *R. Barclay*, wherein he saith, *It doth appear at what an high Rate we value the Scriptures.* How this may appear to you, in your differing **Light**, I cannot tell; but I assure you, that it does not appear so to us; but quite the contrary; and I am perswaded it will not appear so to any judicious and impartial **Reader** before we have done.

To

To use his own Words, *I wonder with what Front he can stand up in the Face of the Conuntry*, and assert their high Esteem for the Scriptures. So have we heard open Violaters of the Laws of the Land, pretend to bring Vouchers for their Honesty and good Behaviour; while every wise Man could see thro' their Veil. With what untoward Grace would such a Pretender come off? who should profess to Love another Person at a very high Rate, but at the same time speak lightly of that Person, and smite him on the Face, and rent his Garments? Thus many of the chief of the Quakers have done by the Scriptures: Attempting to perswade Men that the Scriptures are of little use in Religion. Is this *to value the Scriptures at an high Rate*? To tell Men that they are *doubtful and uncertain in their Meaning*; and that its possible they may have passed thro' *many Changes*; that they cannot be a *certain Rule of Faith*. Is this *R. Barclay's high Esteem of the Scriptures*? And could this very Man *praise God* for keeping the Scriptures *uncorrupt*, when he himself saith that its possible they may have been *corrupted*. All his Praise to God can amount to no more than this, That he Thanks God that the Scriptures are not much more corrupted than he finds them. This is a sly Insinuation; but I could shew them that some of their Friends Writings are much altered from the first Impression, by leaving out many Expressions; which, by the way, is no Evidence of their Believing those Writings to have been given out by Inspiration of God. We believe it would be very dangerous for any Man to blot out any part of the holy Scriptures. Rev. 22. 18, 19. *If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book; and if any Man shall take away from the Words of this Book of the Prophecy,*
God

God shall take away his Part out of the *Book of Life*; and out of the holy City, and from the things that are written in this Book. And all the Enemies of the Scriptures have ever had such a dread upon them, that they dare not alter them. But when your Friends have alter'd much of what *G. Fox* had first written from the Mouth of the Lord God, and by immediate Inspiration of the Spirit. Did your Friends believe him, or did they not? If they did believe him, then how came they to blot out, or to alter what the Spirit of God had Spoken by him? But if they did not believe him to be inspired, how came they to reprint his Works, after he had been in his Grave? Consider how you shall answer for these things; for many think you have acted herein, directly contrary to your avowed Principles; and given to the World undeniable Proof of the Corruption of your Friend's Writings, and of your own Unbelief; and have demonstrated that your Rule is Changeable.

R. Barclay, instead of his Sincerity, he talks of, is guilty of Prevarication, when he saith, this is the Opinion of the Quakers, *That no Writings in the World are to be compared to the Scriptures.* What! are not the Quakers Writings in the World? And will he say that they are not to be compared to the Scriptures? When (as they say) they were given out by the same Spirit, and by the immediate Inspiration of God? And in the same Measure of Inspiration as the Apostles had? May not those Writings be compared with the Scriptures? *R. Barclay* saith they may not. But others of their Leaders have said, *That the Writings of the Quakers are of Equal Authority with the Scriptures.* *E. Burrough.* *This I have received from God. And for this Cause hath he called and chosen faithful Witnesses, and given his powerful Ministry,*

Ministry, by the Gift of the Holy Ghost, as it was in the Apostles Days. Meas. of the Times, p. 26. Again, No other Testimony do we give, or hold forth; but the same which the Apostles did, which we have received from Christ, as the Apostles did. Many strong Reasons confuted, p. 18. And G. Whitehead asserts, That what is spoken by the Spirit of Truth in any, is of as great Authority as the Scriptures and greater. Ser. Apol. p. 49.

THEIR Opinion concerning the Scriptures is, that they are an *human Testimony*; tho' they hold, that their Friend's Writings are a *divine Testimony*. But to palliate the Matter, they say that the Scriptures are the *best human Testimony*. But if they are no more than *human*, then they insinuate, that the Scriptures come as short of their Friends Writings, as *human* comes short of *divine*: And therefore cannot be so good and useful, or so worthy of Esteem as the Testimony of their own Friends, for they say their Writings are of *greater Authority* than the Scriptures.

BUT it does not appear to me that R. Barclay by these Words (*any other Writings in the World*) does at all intend the Writings of the Quakers; but the Writings of the Men of the World, by which they intend all others except Quakers; for if this was not his meaning, there are many Quakers that would not believe him. For any Man would ask him, Why is not the Inspiration of the Spirit of the same Authority, in one Age as in another? They never speak so contemptibly of their own Writings, as they do of the Scriptures. "Your Teacher is carnal, made
" by the Will of Man; and your Original is
" carnal, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and your Word
" is carnal the Letter; and the Light is carnal
" the Letter; and your Baptism is carnal, and
" their Sacraments, as they call them, are carnal,
" and

“ and their Communion is carnal, a little Bread
 “ and Wine ; and so Drunkards, Railers and
 “ cursed Speakers, all meet together in this Fel-
 “ lowship, which is the Table of Devils, and
 “ Cup of Devils, so Dust is the Serpents Meat,
 “ their Original is but Dust, which is but the
 “ Letter, which is Death ; and their Gospel is
 “ Dust, *Matthew, Mark, Luke and John*, which is
 “ the Letter.” *G. Fox*, several Papers for the spread-
 ing of Truth, p. 45, 46. Thus you see how the
 Spirits of the Quakers contradict one another.
 One faith that the Scriptures are *Divine*, another
 faith they are *Human* and Carnal ; one faith that
 no Writings in the World are to be compared
 to them ; another faith, that the Writings of
 their Friends are of greater Authority than the
 Scriptures. These contrary Assertions cannot be
 both true ; thus the Light within is a very un-
 certain, and therefore cannot be an infallible and
 safe Guide. Now I leave it to any Man to judge,
 whether you have really vindicated *R. Barclay*
 in his Assertion, as you undertook to do ; and
 if not, consider next how to answer for your-
 self.

If the Scriptures were given by Inspiration of
 God, then they are the *Word of God*, or (to use
 their own Expression) they are the *Words of God*,
 or a Revelation of the Mind and Will of God.
 Then they are not an *human* but *divine* Testi-
 mony. As they are a Revelation of the Will
 of God, they are a Rule of Faith, Worship and
 Life. And if the Scriptures are not so, why do
 some of the Quakers use some Parts of them in
 their Speaking and Writings ? Is it not to per-
 swade Men, that they ground their Doctrines
 upon the Scriptures ? If so, does not this look
 like *walking in craftiness, and handling the Word*
of God deceitfully ? What do you quote Scrip-
 ture

ture for? When at the same time you hold that *the Scriptures are not the Word of God*, and affirm that they are an *human Testimony*; if they are not the Word of God, then they are not a Rule of Faith and Worship. And then do you not impose upon your Hearer or Reader, when you pretend to prove your Doctrines from the Scriptures? What! will you prove your Doctrines to be true by an *human Testimony*? But let us hear what *S. Fisher's Spirit* says with regard to the Scriptures. *Rust. p. 310. The Letter of the Scriptures is but a broken Cistern, that can hold no Water.* This is but a Cheat put upon the Reader, to say the *Letter*: For we do not say that the *Letter* is our Rule of Faith, any more than the *Paper* or the *Ink*. But it is the *Matter*, or the *revealed Will of God*, contained in the Scriptures, that we make the Rule of our Faith. *Isaac Pennington, Catech. p. 28.* saith, "But now this Principle [*the Light within*] is made manifest, their Reading and Setting up a Knowledge of the Scriptures without this; yea, in Opposition to this, this increaseth their Death and Bondage, and shuts them out of Life. What kind of Knowledge wilt thou gather from the Scriptures? Not a Knowledge that will humble thee, and cleanse thy Heart; but a Knowledge that will puff thee up, and fit thee for the Slaughter." In Opposition to this Doctrine our Lord Jesus Christ saith, *That the Scriptures testify of him*; and bids Men to *search the Scriptures*, in Order to obtain the Knowledge of him, *John 5. 39.* Now, if they will ask us, what kind of Knowledge Men gain by the Scriptures? We answer, *Men gain the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, which is Eternal Life, John 17. 3.* This is the most needful and profitable Knowledge. Surely that cannot be the Knowledge that puffeth up, (as *I.*

Pennington has faſſly aſſerted) But the Knowledge of a Man's Poverty and Miſery, which tends to humble him, and make Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs to be the more eſteem'd. This makes us conclude that *S. Filber*, *R. Barclay*, and *I. Pennington*, were ſtrangers to that Knowledge of themſelves and of Jeſus Chriſt, which many have obtained thro' the Operation of the Holy Spirit, working by the Scriptures. *E. Burroughs* ſaith, *That the Scriptures are not the ſtanding Rule ; neither doth it teach to Serve and Worſhip God.* *Faſſe Principles*, p. 5. Again he ſaith, *That the Saints have no need of the Scriptures to teach them.* Yet he ſaith, *They that Witneſs this, do not make the Scriptures of none Effect ; but owns it in its Place ; yet not as a Teacher.* *Princip. of the Quak.* p. 7. Here you may ſee, that they ſet at Variance the *Spirit of God* (the Efficient) and the *Scriptures*, which are the ordinary Means whereby the Spirit of God teaches Men. What if the Spirit of God himſelf is the beſt *Teacher* and *Leader* of his People ; yet he is pleaſed to make Uſe of the written Word, and the Miniſtry of it, to teach Men the way of Salvation. But by the *Spirit of God*, they mean nothing more than the *Light* within. *E. Burroughs* ſaith, *No Man ever yet could, or can prove, in all the Scriptures, that the Letter, the Writings, are called the Word.* *Princip. of the Quak.* p. 19. This is fully answer'd, in another Place, of this Book.

ANOTHER of their Leaders puts this Queſtion, *As for the Terms, Revealed, or written Word, or Will of God ; where ſaith the Scriptures ſuch Words ? I require you, and your Doctōrs again to prove it.* *G. Biſh. Mene Tek.* p. 17. 1659 Again, *How can or dare any to ſay, without the higheſt Blaſphemy, that the Scriptures, or any viſible comprehenſible Thing is the Word of God,* p. 22. Again, *To ſay that*
that

that is the written Word, or Will of God (which the Scriptures no where say of themselves) is as absurd as Blasphemous, p. 23. How this is directly contrary to the Language of the Scriptures, I have shewn elsewhere.

PAGE 25. He owns, *That the Scriptures are called a Revelation of the Mind of God, to Mankind, written by the Apostles as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* Yet, after this, he exactly follows the Method of R. Barclay, that is first to commend, and then to disparage the Scriptures; by saying, *What was the Rule before the Scriptures were written? For, saith he, The Scriptures could not be a Rule before they were in being; which was a thousand Years after the Creation of the World: Therefore there must have been some Rule, antecedent to the Scriptures, which was the Spirit of God; by whose Direction, and under whose Influence they were written; and consequently the Spirit of God must be the principal Rule.* I answer, That the World was not without a Rule before the Scriptures were written; for God chose to reveal his Will to Men another way; that is by a lively Voice, or by Dreams, or by Ministration of Angels; and now and then, by the Ministry of the Prophets: But these were Favours afforded but to very few of all Mankind, and very seldom; as is exemplify'd in the particular Cases of Abraham, Lot, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, &c. Unto which the Apostle refers, *Heb. 1. 1. God, who at sundry Times, and in divers Manners, spake to our Fathers, by the Prophets, &c.* This was to the Fathers; not a Priviledge afforded in common to all: For the greatest Part of the World at that Day, was left to the dim Light of Nature, or Light within, without divine Revelation; as was the Case of the whole World afterwards, untill God sent the Gospel Revelation to them. And
what-

whatever the Light within was to them, they are all said, till that Time, *to sit in Darkneſs, and the Regions of the Shadow of Death.*

WE own that the Scriptures of themſelves are not ſufficient to Salvation, without the Power of the Spirit of God, accompanying them; but we believe alſo, that the Spirit of God teaches, works upon, and leads Souls, in order to Salvation by *the written Word.*

WE alſo acknowledge, that the Spirit of God is the *Author* of the Goſpel Rule of Faith; and as the Scriptures are the revealed *Will* of God, and the *Mind of the Spirit*; ſo thoſe that are try'd by the Scriptures, are judged and try'd by the Spirit of God. But what if we grant them, that the *Spirit of God*, who is the Holy Ghoſt, is to be owned as the ſole Judge of all Doctrines, and of all Controverſies in Religion; yet we cannot own that every Man's *private Spirit* is to be the Judge of Controverſies. We think we have good Reaſon to conclude, that ſome of you take your own ſtrong Imaginations to be the immediate Impulſe and Inſpiration of the Spirit of God. But it is ſtrange that ſome of you cannot be convinc'd of this fatal Miſtake; when you ſee and hear frequent Contradictions among yourſelves, and your Brethren, in their Preaching and Writings; both of them cannot be right; therefore one of them muſt be under a Spirit of Deluſion: For the Spirit of God never contradicts its ſelf. But I will give you an Inſtance of this, in the Caſe before us, *R. Barclay* ſaith, *That the Scriptures were given by Inſpiration of God.* But *W. Penn* ſaith, *That we can never prove, by Authority of the Scriptures, that they were given ſo by Inſpiration of God.* Rejoynder to J. Faldo, p. 38. 1673. It is ſtrange that *W. Penn*, a Man pretending to divine Inſpiration, ſhould be Ignorant of
the

that Text, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God.* And I have shewn that *G. Fox* joyn'd with *W. Penn* against *R. Barclay*, and saith, *That the Scriptures are an human Testimony.* Behold how the **Light** within contradicts its self ! But *H. B.* puts it to the Question, " Whether " the Spirit of Christ, by his immediate Manifestation, be the primary and principal Rule, " or the Scriptures, which are the mediate Rule, " be the primary and only Rule ; and so the " Manifestations of the Spirit be Subordinate " to them ? " I think it is very easy to determine this Matter : Whether the Holy Scriptures, which are a clear and full Revelation of the Mind of God, be the Standard to try Doctrines and Spirits ; seeing they come fully confirm'd to us with the Broad Seal of the King of Heaven, in the many Miracles wrought by the Spirit of God for their Confirmation. The Scriptures, therefore, are a more sure Rule of Faith, Worship and Practice, than the Light within can be ; seeing that pretended Rule, was never confirmed by any Miracle from Heaven. We own that the Spirit of God, who is the Holy Ghost, by whose Inspiration the Scriptures were given out, is above the Scriptures ; but we very needfully distinguish between the Spirit of God, and the Spirit which the Quakers talk of ; which at best can be but some Work of the Spirit ; but, to speak plain, we are affraid, it is that Spirit of Delusion, who transforms himself into an Angel of Light, to seduce such Souls as will not comply with Temptations to open Prophaness ; and thus he turns Men to rest in themselves and their own Works, like Self-Righteous Pharisees ; being too proud to submit to the Righteousness of Christ ; unless it be that Righteousness which they themselves have an Hand in working out, as *S. Fisher* has affirmed.

AFTER

AFTER this *H. B.* attempts to prove, that there are immediate Revelations, and Manifestations of the Spirit; because Christians, of several Denominations, pray for the Assistance of the Spirit, to perform the several Duties of Religion. And he saith, That it would be preposterous to pray for that which cannot be obtain'd. I answer, Tho' we pray for the Assistance of the Spirit of God, to perform the Duties of Religion, and cannot satisfy ourselves with a Form of Godliness, without the Power; or with Ordinances, without the God of Ordinances. Yet it will not follow from thence, that the Light within is that Spirit of God, whose Influences we pray for; nor will it prove that the Light within is a better Rule to walk by, than the Holy Scriptures; the Conclusion is false and groundless. The fair Conclusion, from our Practice of praying for the Assistance of the Spirit of God, is this, that we own that the Scriptures are ineffectual to Salvation, without the Power of the Spirit of God accompanying the Ministration of them: And that we do not rest in bare Ordinances, but look up to God for his Blessing upon them. Therefore, your Inference is weak and fallacious, and a blind put upon your Reader: This can never prove that, in effect, we own the Light within to be the primary Rule; for we don't look *within* us for assistance, but to the Spirit of God *without* us, even to Heaven, whence our Help must come.

ONE Scripture which *H. B.* brings to prove, that the Spirit which the Quakers receive, is the first and principal Rule to walk by, is, 1 Cor. 12. 7. *But the Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal.* I answer, that's very true; we never deny the Words of Scripture. Every Spiritual Gift is given to us, to profit our selves and others withal, as much as

we can. But how does that prove that the Spirit, or Light within them, is the primary Rule? which *H. B.* brought it to prove; there is nothing in it to his purpose: For I might as well argue thus, That the Holy Scriptures themselves are given to every Man to profit withal; therefore the Scriptures are the primary Rule; and the Argument is as strong, and much more true than his: For the Truth of it is attested by the Scriptures themselves, *all Scripture is given by Inspiration of God; there's Inspiration; and is profitable for Doctrine, &c.* there it is affirm'd that it is given to profit withal: Therefore by your own Argument, the Scriptures are the primary Rule. Another Scripture that he brings, to prove that *their* Spirit or Light within, is the primary Rule is, *1 Cor. 2. 10. But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.* Here again, he confounds the *Holy Spirit of God*, with the *Light within*; for that's what he means by *the Spirit*. We believe, and heartily own that the *Spirit of God*, who is very *God*, searches *all things*, yea, the *deep things of God*; (and no Man can deny it without the greatest Blasphemy.) But can the Spirit in the Quakers do so? Or can the Light within search all things; yea the deep things of God? If this Text may be apply'd to the Spirit in every Quaker, then it may be equally apply'd to every Heathen, or Pagan; for by their own Confession, these have the *Light within*, as well as the Quakers; but does the Spirit in Heathens and Pagans, search the deep things of God too? If so, how is it said that they are, *without God and without Christ, in the World*? These Contraries cannot be both true; therefore we conclude that the Spirit, spoken of in the Text last quoted, is not intended of the *Light within*, but of the

Holy Spirit, one of the divine Persons in the *Holy Trinity*. He also quotes *verse 11.* for the same purpose, *For what Man knoweth the things of a Man, save the Spirit, (that is the Soul of Man) that is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God.* This is intended of the Spirit, who is very God; and not of the Light within. In each of these Texts there is nothing to his purpose; but he most wretchedly wrests the Scriptures; applying to their own private Spirit, that which belongs alone to the Spirit of God. The Spirit, who is very God, searches and knows the deep things of God; but does it follow from thence, that every Man, good and bad, can do so too? The Reason of this Question is, because they say every Man, good and bad, has the Spirit. Yet, with an Air of Assurance, he adds, *were I to transcribe all the Passages of Scripture, to this purpose, it would make a Book as big as this Letter.* Yes verily, and so it might, if he should quote Scriptures, as little to his Purpose, as those which he has already chosen; and what would he gain by it, when he had done it? but shew his own Ignorance, and discover the nakedness of his Principles, and expose himself and opinion to Contempt. But saith he, *I need not trouble the Reader with any more.* No verily, for it would be but Imposition upon the Reader; those already mention'd are of no Service at all, but to let the Reader see, how unhappy you are in the choice of Proofs for your halting Cause; and how barren your Principles are of Proofs; for none of these prove that we have our Knowledge by the immediate Inspiration of the Spirit. We own that spiritual, sanctified and transforming Knowledge of God, of Jesus Christ and of the Will of God, can be obtain'd no other way, than by the Power and

Grace

Grace of the Spirit of God, on the Soul. Men may obtain a notional Knowledge of the Scriptures, by outward Helps, as Reading, Hearing, and Conversation with those that are more knowing. The Spirit of God also conveys saving Light and Understanding to the Soul, by the use of those means, without immediate Revelation from Heaven. We are assured that the Spirit of God does work by the use of *Means*; we have learnt it from the Scriptures; and from our own *Experience*. You shall see how the Word and Spirit go together. 1 Cor. 13. 11. *So we preach, and so ye believed.* Rom. 10. 17. *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God.* But here lies their fatal Mistake, that they give to the *Light within*, the Title of the *Spirit*; and then argue, to the confounding of the Simple, "That surely the Spirit of God must be greater than the Scriptures"; which any one will readily own, provided they intend it of the Holy Ghost, who gave out the Scriptures; whereas, the Question honestly stated, would run thus, *Whether the Light within every Man, be a better Rule than the holy Scriptures?* For they use the Word *Spirit* to amuse the Reader; they know in their own Conscience, that by the *Spirit*, they mean no more than the *Light within*. But if the Question was thus plainly proposed, it would endanger their Cause; for it would easily be answered in the Negative by every Christian. But they load this Matter with such a multitude of doubtful Terms and Expressions, as few besides themselves can understand; and many of their Followers can give but a lame account of. But I shall take more notice of this under the Head of the *Light within*, therefore I dismiss it here.

H. B. faith, *That the Knowledge of God, is no other way to be obtained, but by the Revelation of*

Jesus Christ. I suppose he means the Light within, and immediate Inspiration. If so, this is utterly false; for the Scriptures tell us, that Men may know the Being and Perfections of God by the study of the Works of Creation. *Psal. 19. 1. The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy Work; Day unto Day uttereth Speech, and Night unto Night sheweth Knowledge,* (that is the Knowledge of God.) And God may be known, in some measure, by his Judgments upon wicked Men. *Psal. 9. 16. The Lord is known by the Judgments that he executeth.* His Wisdom, Power, Justice and Holiness are known this way. Therefore this Assertion of *H. B.* is false. We own that the best Knowledge of God, is obtained by Jesus Christ. If *H. B.* had said that the *saving* Knowledge of God is obtained only by Jesus Christ; we own it; but that's not what he asserted; so indiscreet and unguarded was he in this Assertion. But his Design seems to be, to make Men believe, that we can obtain no Knowledge of God, but by the Light within, that's what he intended, by the Revelation of Jesus Christ; the Christ within, and the Revelation within, and not of the Scriptures; but we do not believe it; nay we can prove, that the best Knowledge of God is obtained thro' the Scriptures. All the Light within, which they so much boast of, would have left them in as gross Darkness, as the benighted Heathens, if they had not been helped by the Light of the Scriptures.

PAGE 28. *H. B.* argues, *That if we deny the immediate Revelation of the Spirit in them, we weaken the Authority of immediate Revelation to those that wrote the Scriptures.* This is childish arguing indeed. What if we should assert, that the Quakers, at this Day, are not divinely inspired; will it follow from thence, that there never was any such thing as immediate Revelation? Or if any should

should say that *H. B.* is not divinely inspired; would it follow from thence that *Moses* or *Paul* were not inspired? This Suggestion is but fallacy, and a meer cheat. If any one should assert that *H. B.* was under Delusion, will it follow that the Prophets and Apostles were so too? I think any one can see the weakness of such arguing.

IN the same Page, he saith, *That for us to give the Precedency to the Scriptures, which should be given to the Spirit of God, is false Philosophy, and to place the effect before the Cause.* Pardon me, good Reader, if I say again, what I said before; (it is a hard task to instruct the conceited and self-will'd.) I hinted before, that by the Spirit of God, they mean no more than their own *private Spirit*, or the *Light* within them. We never did affirm that the Scriptures are to be preferred before the Spirit of *God*, who gave out the Scriptures; but that the Scriptures are a better Rule than the *Light within*, which never gave them forth. Which *Light* they call the Spirit, but we deny it, and on the contrary affirm, that at best it can be but some Work or Gift of the Spirit.

H. B. intimates that the *Light* within is the Cause of the Scriptures, and that the Scriptures are an *Effect* of the *Light* within; but he does not speak it plain, as honest Men should express the Principles they hold. They rather choose to speak mysteriously, because many would abhor their Principles, if they were brought above Board, which they seem industriously to avoid, for fear of the Consequences; therefore they choose such Expressions as may (like *Janus's* Face, look two ways; or like the Answers given out by the Oracle of *Apollo*) admit of a double Interpretation; that they may leave room for a retreat, when they are driven to a strait. Therefore they
make

make the Word *Christ* to serve for the Light within, or *Christ* in Heaven. And the Word *Spirit* to serve for the Spirit of God, or the Light within, or any strong Impressions upon their own Minds. Thus they make the Spirit, or Light within, either the *Cause* or the *Effect*, as their occasion most calls for it: For they say it is *God*, *Christ*, the *Spirit*, a *Measure of the Spirit*, the *Seed*, the *Law*, and the *Gospel*. And I add, it is an *Idol*. It is the whole of the Quakers Religion, to look to, believe in, and obey the Light in themselves. But this Idol must fall before the Ark of God; and as it has neither Head nor Tail, so it will be found to be a god that cannot save; therefore it is in vain to trust to this broken Reed; a Fiction of something that is neither God nor Man.

PAGE 29. *H. B.* adds, "*Our Lord Jesus Christ is the chief Guide and Rule, he declares himself, John 14. 6. I am the Way, the Truth and the Life, no Man cometh to the Father but by me. Surely then he must be the Rule, who is the Way, and the only Way; the Scriptures speak of Christ, they direct to him, and therefore he must be the principal Rule, and they (the Scriptures) the subordinate, or secondary Rule.*" I never met with more ridiculous Arguing, except in *G. Fox's* Writings, it would grieve a Man to have to do with one that neither offers Reason, or receives it when brought to him. We say that the holy Scriptures are the *revealed* Will of God; they are the Laws which God gave out, to guide and direct our Faith and Practice. But what Confusion is *H. B.* guilty of, not to make any distinction between the *King* and the *Laws* of the King. The *King of England* is not our Rule, how we ought to behave ourselves, as good Subjects; but the *Laws* of the Kingdom are

are our Rule: So Jesus Christ himself is not our Rule; he is our *Ruler*, but not our *Rule*; but the Scriptures, which are the revealed Will of Christ are our *Rule* of Faith and Practice. Jesus Christ is the great Builder of his Spiritual House, and therefore is *worthy of more Honour than the House*. But ought we not to distinguish between the *Person* that builds, and the *Rule* by which he is pleased to build? Jesus Christ makes use of his Ministers, as *Workers together with him*, to build the Spiritual House, and the Scriptures are their *Rule*, by which they are to Work, and Order all things, in the Spiritual Building; and frame every Part according to that Standard: For whatsoever does not square therewith, will be disapprov'd.

I hope *H. B.* will not forget the Words that he quoted out of *R. Barclay*, "That whatsoever Doctrine is contrary to this Testimony (the Scriptures) may therefore be utterly rejected as false. And that whatsoever any speak, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, shall be reckon'd a Delusion of the Devil." But I proceed: neither Gospel Ministers, nor Jesus Christ, nor the Spirit of God, can properly be called our Rule of Faith and Practice; but the *revealed Will* of Christ, or of the Spirit of God. Deut. 29. 29. *The Secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed, belong unto us and to our Children for ever, that we may do all the Words of this Law.* Hereby we learn that we are not to wait for and expect new Revelations; God has settled one Revelation of the holy Scriptures, to be the Standard of Truth forever. As for that needless Question, "What then shall all those Parts of the World do, that have not the Rule of the Scriptures?" I Answer as Jesus Christ did to *Peter*,
when

when he said, *And what shall this Man do?* Jesus answer'd him, *What is that to thee? follow thou me.* So I say to you; leave the Sovereign of Heaven and Earth to do with all his Creatures as seemeth good to himself; for *the Judge of all the Earth will do right.* He knows how to silence all Cavillers at his Word and Providences. Those Parts of the World, that have not the Gospel, will do as all the Gentiles did, before the Gospel was sent to them. But *H B.* adds, "What can "be more in the Favour of the Quakers than "this"? I suppose he means, both his former Quotations out of *John 14.* and especially *John 5. 39. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal Life; and they are they that testify of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye might have Life.* How this Scripture favours the Quakers, as to their Notion of Christ's being the only Rule, I believe none can make out, without first putting on the Quakers Spectacles; for if the Scriptures must be *searched*, in Order to know Jesus Christ, and they are the only means of knowing him; then the *Scriptures* are the only Rule. We do not make them our Saviour, but they point out the Saviour; *they are they*, saith he, the only Writings, *that testify of me.* The Scriptures are not *our Rest*, but they lead to the Saviour, who is our Rest. Tho' Jesus Christ is *the Way, the Truth and the Life*, yet the Scriptures direct and lead us to Christ, who is that *Way*. Now, if Men are charged to *search the Scriptures*, in order to gain the Knowledge of Christ, that they may obtain eternal Life, then that Scripture makes for us. We use it naturally, or take it in its true and genuine Sense; but you *wrest the Scriptures*, to make them speak what they never intended. I wish the Counsel there given was better observed by you, for many of you are very defective

in this Duty of *Searching the Scriptures*; your Principles lead you to a very differing Exercise. If any Man should ask you how shall I gain the Knowledge of Christ? for I have read, *John 17. 3. This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* What would you Answer such an Inquirer? You don't use to say, *Search the Scriptures*, but turn into thy self, *hearken to the Light, obey the Light, believe in the Light within, attend to the Guide within.* You know that this is your Gospel. And if any Soul is under a Sense of Sin, and enquires, *What shall I do to be saved?* Your Gospel is, look to the Light, obey the Light within. How differing is this from the Gospel of Christ? *Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye Ends of the Earth.* And it is contrary to the Practice of the Saints, *Psal. 5. 3. My Voice shalt thou hear in the Morning, O Lord, in the Morning will I direct my Prayer unto thee, and will look up.* He does not say, I will look within, but look up: For our Help must come from the Name of the Lord that made Heaven and Earth. But H. B. argues, that because Men are called upon, by the Scriptures, to come to Christ, therefore the Scriptures cannot be the principal Rule. His Argument seems to be this, "because the Scriptures make Jesus Christ the End, therefore the Scriptures cannot be the Means in Order to the End." The Fallacy is manifest, and his Philosophy is just as good as his Divinity. They want the necessary Distinction, between Jesus Christ the Author of Salvation, and the Scriptures, which are the ordinary Means of Salvation. But observe, that by the Term *Christ*, they mean the *Light within*; and when they say that the Scriptures call Men to turn to Christ, they mean to turn inward, and look for Salvation by turning to, and obeying Christ within. Now, if by Christ

H and

and the Spirit, they mean only Christ within and the Spirit within; then by setting this Christ, and this Spirit, above the Scriptures, they fall into the very same false Philosophy that he blam'd in me, tho' unjustly, of putting the Effect before the Cause. This Spirit, which they boast of, that they say is above the Scriptures, cannot be the Spirit of God, but a Spirit of Delusion: because it teaches Men to slight the Scriptures. Can it be reasonably suppos'd that the same Spirit, that inspired some of old to *write* the Scriptures, does now inspire others to *sight* them? The Spirit of God never did contradict himself; therefore, it naturally follows, that either the Prophets and Apostles were not divinely inspired; or else those that slight the Scriptures now, are inspired by a Spirit directly contrary to the Spirit of God who gave out the Scriptures. For, the same Light within, which sometimes they call the Spirit, at other times they call Christ, cannot be that Christ who is both God and Man, and therefore can be no other than that Christ which *W. Penn* calls a *moral Virtue*, such as *Meekness, Temperance, &c.* So that your Christ within, cannot be the Christ at the right Hand of God; for if the Christ within be but a *moral Virtue*, then your Christ is *neither God nor Man*; and had no *Flesh* to suffer, or *Blood* to shed. If *Grace* in the *Heart*, which you call Christ, and you say he was born within, and died and rose within, and is the same with Christ in *Heaven*, then the same Light within must be both *the mighty God*, and *the Seed of the Woman*, and the *Seed of David*, according to the *Flesh*. Is your Light within so? If not, it cannot be the Saviour of Men; because it is not our *near Kinsman*. Is your Light within, *the very Lamb of God that taketh away the Sins of the World*? And that very Christ that ever lives in *Heaven* to make

make Intercession for those that come to God? And that very Christ, in whose Name we are to pray to God? And that Christ, whom all Men should Honour, as they Honour the Father? Then you may Worship the measure of the Spirit, as you Worship God the Father.

PAGE 30, 31. *H. B.* gives us his Reason, such as it is, why he cannot call the Scriptures the Word of God. *Because that Name, or Term is given to Jesus Christ.* And for a needless Proof of that which none denies, he brings, *John 1. 1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* And ver. 14. *And the Word was made [or took] Flesh, and dwelt among us.* And Rev. 19. 13. *And he was clothed in a Vesture dipt in Blood [therefore this could not be the Light within] and his Name was called the Word of God.* All this we own; Jesus Christ is the *Essential* Word of God; and the Scriptures are the *Written* Word of God. And if the Spirit of God, who inspired certain Men to write them, has often called them by the Name of the *Word of God*; we believe we may do so too, without Sin against God, or just occasion of Offence to good Men: And we *ought* to call the Scriptures by such Names as the Spirit of God has given them, rather than devise new Terms: For this is a good Means to preserve a due Esteem for the Scriptures in the Minds of those that read and hear them; that the Threatnings, Precepts and Promises may be duly regarded by us. But *H. B.* affirms that the many Scriptures, which I had quoted in the REVIEW, to prove that the Scriptures call themselves the *Word*, and the *Word of God*. Not one of them, saith he, doth prove any such Matter; for where the *Word of God* is mentioned, the Spirit is intended, p. 31. But he should have told us, whether it was intended of

the Spirit of God, or the Light within. Neither, saith he, *can it be taken for the Bible collectively; seeing a considerable Part of it was not then Written.* Some of his Friends have confidently affirmed, *That the Scriptures, no where call themselves the Word of God, E. Bur. Truth Vind. p. 3.* Now let us Search the Scriptures, whether these things are so. And I will first shew you what Scriptures were produc'd, in the REVIEW. And then see whether the Word is every where to be understood of the Spirit; as H. B. affirms, *Isa. 2. 1. The Word that Isaiah, the Son of Amos saw, concerning Judah and Jerusalem.* This Word must be understood not of the Spirit, but the Message of the Spirit, and that's the Scriptures. *Isa. 55. 11. So shall my Word be, that goeth out of my Mouth.* Now see what excellent nonsense it would make to read it as H. B. would have us, so shall my Spirit be that goeth out of my Mouth. *Jer. 7. 1. The Word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord.* It is the same that is also called the Words of the Lord. *Stand in the Gate of the Lord's House and speak these Words, Jer. 45. 1. The Word (or Message) that Jeremiah spake unto Baruch.* That cannot be read, *The Spirit which Jeremiah spake. Luke 8. 11. 12. Now the Parable is this, the Seed is the Word of God, those by the Way side, are those that hear; then cometh the Devil and taketh away the Word.* That cannot be read that the Devil taketh away the Spirit. It is God that puts his Spirit within his People, and the Devil cannot take it away; that would be strange Doctrine indeed; for Christ has said, *he shall abide with you for ever.* Thus, you see, that they rather choose to run into farther Absurdities, than to own their Mistake. *Acts 4. 31. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the Word.* Who could be so weak as to read, they spake the

the *Spirit*? All these Texts plainly shew us that tho' they consist of many *Words*, yet are called the *Word*.

Now let us see some other Texts that shew us that the Scriptures are called the *Word of God*, Acts 13. 7. *Sergius Paulus, a prudent Man, who called for Barnabas and Paul, and desired to hear the Word of God.* That *Word* which they desired to hear, was the *Message* of God from their Mouths. So, 2 Cor. 2. 17. *We are not as many, who corrupt the Word of God.* That could not be intended of *Christ*, who is God; he cannot be corrupted: Neither can it be intended of the *Spirit* of God, as *H. B.* has weakly asserted; but it is intended of the Scriptures. And corrupting them, is to misinterpret, or to wrest them, as *H. B.* has done, when he saith that by the *Word* in all these Places, we are to read *Spirit*. So, 2 Cor. 4. 2. *But have renounced the hidden things of Dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, or handling the Word of God deceitfully.* That can't be read, handling *Christ* deceitfully, or handling the *Spirit* of God deceitfully; but to abuse the Scriptures, to support false Doctrines, that's *handling the Word of God deceitfully*; and if Men will devise doubtful Expressions, to cover their Principles, that's *walking in craftiness*: And it is no very difficult Task to shew who do so; I think the last Instances may serve for a Glass for *H. B.* and his Friends to see their Faces.

BUT *H. B.* has another Reason, as he thinks, why they may not call the Scriptures the *Word of God*; because in them are recorded the Words of *wicked Men*, and even of the *Devil himself*. This is trifling, this makes nothing against the Scriptures being the *Word of God*; for they were written by Men inspir'd by the Holy Ghost; and it were not possible for them to compleat the History

story of the Bible, without recording what wicked Men and Devils have spoken or done. How could the History of the Creation and of Providence, or the History of the Life, Temptations and Death of Jesus Christ have been compleated without it? Let any one read the History of Christ's Temptations, *Mat. 4.* and leave out every thing that the Devil spake, and see what any one could have made of that useful History. But let this Trifler observe, that we do not say that every one that is represented to speak in Scripture, was inspired; but that the Pen-men of the Scriptures were inspired by the Spirit of God. Now I hope that this grand Mistake, of the Leaders of the Quakers, will be obvious to the Reader; that is, *that the Scriptures, as they affirm, no where call themselves the Word of God.* Yet I shall add a few Scriptures more to the same purpose. *Eph. 6. 17. And take the Helmet of Salvation, and the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.* What Nonsense would be made of this Text, if instead of *the Word of God*, any should read it, as *H. B.* would have us, either of *Christ*, or the *Spirit*! But the written Word, is the Sword which the Spirit of God uses in Conviction and Conversion of Sinners. In that respect it is *sharper than any Two-edged Sword.* *Prov. 30. 5. Every Word of God is pure.* That informs us, that there must be more than one Word of God, because it is said, *Every Word of God*, that is every Portion of the Scriptures is so: Unmixed, free from Corruptions, therefore also called *the Sincere Milk of the Word*; and pure, as it is holy; and requires Holiness in all. Again, *Luke 4. 4. Man shall not live by Bread alone, but by every Word of God.* Every Word implies more than one. Hereupon I shewed the Deceitfulness of some of their Leaders; that tho' they pretended *Conscience*, for not calling the Scriptures

tures the *Word of God*; yet they call *their own Writings the Word*, and the *Word of the Lord*, and the *Word of God*. *G. Fox's* several Papers given forth for spreading the Truth (as they call it) p. 24. 1671. *faith, This is the Word of the Lord God to you all*. Again, *This is God's Word to you all*. And, p. 35. *To all ignorant People, the Word of the Lord*. p. 41. *The Word of the Lord to you all*. p. 60, 61. *Friends, to you all this is the Word of the Lord; this is the Word of the Lord unto you. This is the Word of the Lord God of Power and Beauty*. p. 62. *To you all, this is the Word of the Lord God*. *G. Fox The Papists Strength*. Lond. 1658. p. 47. *This is the Word of the Lord God to you*. And *Viols of the Wrath of God*, p. 7. 9. *The Word of the Lord to you all — and to you, this is the Word of God*. p. 10. *The Word of the Lord to you all*. p. 12. *And to you, this is the Word of God*. *G. Fox of Bowing*. Lond. p. 30. 1657. *And to you, this is the Word of the Lord God*. And in his Declaration. Lond. 1657. p. 3. *This is the Word of the Lord God*. And *E. Burroughs Measure of the Times*, p. 36. *This is the Word of the Lord God*. And *W. Bayley*, p. 293. *This is the Word of the Lord God unto all the People upon Earth*. Again, *Isaac Pennington*, p. 95. 1658. *To you this is the Word of the Lord God*. They do not say, these be the *Words of God*. They are not affraid of applying to their own Writings what, they say, belongs to Christ, as *H. B.* pretends is their Reason why they cannot call the Scriptures the *Word of God*. And in many other Places, they use this Expression, tho' they will not allow it to the Scriptures. Where is the sincerity of these Men, that pretend Conscience for not calling the Scriptures the *Word of God*? and yet commonly call *their own Writings* so. But now take Notice of another cheat, *H. B.* replies to this, and saith, "If
G. Fox

" G. Fox did say of his own Writings, This is
 " the Word of the Lord, he had the Example
 " of the Prophets for so doing, and whosoever
 " has such immediate Revelation, has right to
 " follow their Example." Here *H. B.* contradicts
 himself; for just now he said, *that the Scriptures,*
or Message is no where called the Word, or the
Word of God, but it is intended of the Spirit;
 and now he saith, that *G. Fox* had the Example
 of the Prophets, in calling his Message the *Word*
of God. Thus he either denies or affirms the same
 thing, according as he has occasion, to serve his
 turn. But *H. B.* saith, that *G. Fox* intended it,
 of the *Counsel* of God. If that be true, then he
 could not intend it of the Spirit of God, as you
 said just now the Prophets did; and yet you say
 that *G. Fox* had their Example. This is saying
 and denying, forward and backward, now one
 thing and then another. But just now, you said
 it was *Christ* and the Spirit, and now you say
 it is the *Message, or Counsel* of God. If you will
 even now, hold to this last Assertion, then I will
 tell you, that it is but a deceitful Pretence, that
 you cannot call the Scriptures, or *Message* from
 God, by the Name of the *Word of God*; and yet
 you plead for the Lawfulness of it, when *G. Fox,*
E. Burroughs and *I. Pennington* call their own *Wri-*
tings the Word of God: This looks like setting
 your selves above the Prophets and Apostles, and
 Pen-men of the holy Scriptures; and we look on
 it as a Piece of great Pride; and done with a
 design to set aside the holy Scriptures, and make
 your own Writings the Standard of Faith and
 Worship. Yet after all this, *he denies that ever*
G. Fox has said any such thing, in that Place which
I quoted.

WHAT if I had printed a Figure false, and
 it could not have been found in that Page, yet
 could

could he be such a Stranger to *G. Fox* (for whom he professes a high Veneration) as not to know that he has often said of his Writings, *This is the Word of God?* This does not look like Simplicity and godly Sincerity. All sincere Souls abhor tricking in Matters of Religion. Yet presently he confesses that he found *that very Expression*, in the *same Page*. Here's Prevaricating! I hope God will open the Eyes of some honest Souls, among them, who at present may follow their Leaders, out of the *Simplicity of their Hearts*, (as some did Absalom, 2 Sam. 15. 11) to consider whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken to the Scriptures, or to the Writings of their Leaders. The close Consideration of these things can hurt no Man. *Isaac Pennington*, p. 15. tells us, *That the Scripture, or Directions taken out of the Scriptures, can be no Rule to a Christian; but they tell us that the Light within is the Rule.* If this be true, why did the Saints, under the Old Testament esteem the Scriptures, which they had, so very highly? Even *better than thousands of Gold and Silver; and better than necessary Food.* O how differing is this from the Language of some of your chief Leaders! who have called the Scriptures *Dung, Dust, and Serpents Meat.* Will you not allow your selves to think, who was in the right, your Friends, or *David and Job?*

PAGE 36. *H. B.* quarrels with the REVIEW, for asserting, that one of their Speakers call'd the Scriptures, *rotten Scriptures*, and thereon he saith, *How can the Author expect to be credited in the Relation? He could not expect that his Story should be credited with thinking Men: It is at best, but an Unknown Woman's Story.* To which I answer, that I offer'd your Friends to give them in Writing, her Name and Place of Habitation, but they did not accept of it; why then do you question the

Truth of the Relation? *H. B.* saith, it is *because I have forfeited my Credit; and am no more to be believed.* But be that as it will, *S. Fisher* has said the same thing; surely you will not call him an Old Woman, *Rust. p. 312.* He was speaking to one that honoured the Scriptures, as our Rule. He saith, *Is your Word of God possible to be utterly corrupted?* Ours is not. *Is your Foundation, Rule, &c. so rotten, such a Nose of Wax?* *Morn. Watch. p. 22, 23.* They call the holy Scriptures, "Traditions of Men, earthly Root, Darknes and Confusion, *Nebuchadnezzar's* Image, Putrefaction and Corruption, rotten and deceitful." *S. Fisher* says, "One Bible would serve a whole Town." And tho' you would blind the Eyes of such as are not acquainted with your Authors, I could put you in mind of other things that they have said, as contemptible of the Scriptures, as those which you represented to be a Lye of my own making. *S. Fisher* said that the Devil had his Original from God, as much as the Scriptures; his Words are these, to *Dr. Owen*, "As to the divine original of the Scriptures, thou pleadest on it's behalf, I deny not, yea, the very Devil himself, as a Creature of God, tho' neither any of his Deeds, which are Sin, neither himself, as a Deceiver, and as immediate an Original from God, — as any mere Scripture in the World." *Rust. p. 412.* Here he seems to insinuate, that tho' the Scriptures might come pure out of the Hand of God, at first, even as the Devil did, being created an Angel of Light; but as the Devil's evil Deeds cannot be charged upon God, so the Scriptures, being now corrupted, and Men being liable to be deceived by them, as Men are deceived by the Devil; therefore the Scriptures cannot be our Rule, being so rotten, and such a Nose of Wax. This is a most vile and odious

Comparrison;

Comparrifon; for, what if the *Devil* and the *Scriptures* had both their Original from God (as indeed all things had) yet is there any Comparrifon between the *Devil* and the *holy Scriptures*, as to their Corruption! Is this a Proof of *their high Esteem of the Scriptures*, that *R. Barclay* and *H. B.* talk of! What viler Treatment have the *Scriptures* ever met with from the worst of all its open Enemies? But *p. 36.* *H. B.* endeavours to wipe off the Odium of that Expression; *That it is dangerous to read the Scriptures.* His Quarrel is that I did not repeat all his Words. But turn and wind your selves which way you will, the Sense will remain to be this, *Here* (in the *Scriptures*) *you read with Danger.* What if those were carnal Men that he spoke to? It is not dangerous for such to read the *Scriptures*; for Jesus Christ commands such to do it, *John 5. 39.* These were carnal Men that were bid to search the *Scriptures*, for it is said of them, *verse 40. Ye will not come to me that ye might have Life*; yet Jesus Christ said to those very Men, *Search the Scriptures.* Did Jesus Christ put them upon an Exercise that was dangerous? No verily, but that which would be profitable to their Souls.

PAGE 38. *H. B.* undertakes to answer for *G. Fox* for calling the *Scriptures Paper and Ink*; his Words are these, *p. 302.* "The *Scriptures*, which signifies Writings, as you say, outward Writings, Paper and Ink, is not infallible, nor is not divine, but human; and a human Knowledge from it Men get; and so Writing, Paper and Ink, that is not infallible, nor the *Scripture* is not the ground of Truth, but Christ, who was before the *Scriptures* were written." What does all this imply? But that they hold that the holy *Scriptures* are not from *Heaven*, but from *Men*. In this *G. Fox* spake *ad Hominem*, *H. B.*

tells us; verily he spake after the Manner of *Carnal Men*, not after the Manner of the *Men of God*; who have ever own'd the holy Scriptures to be *divine*, not *human*, to have their Original from *Heaven*, not of *Men*, *Gal. 1. 11, 12.* And accordingly have esteem'd them *better than thousands of Gold and Silver*, *Psal. 119. 72.* and *better than necessary Food*, *Job 23. 12.* But *G. Fox* shew'd the greatest Contempt of the Scriptures, in the Place *H B.* pretends to Vindicate. But what a wonderful Discovery is this, that *Christ* was before the *Scriptures* were written! Is there any Argument in it, that because *God* himself was before his own *Laws*, therefore his *Laws*, or his revealed Will, cannot be the Ground of Truth? What did *God* reveal his Will for, either under the Old Testament or the New, but to be a *Rule* to Men, what to believe, and what to do, or how to live, in order to get safe to Heaven? And what if *God* took a differing way, before the Scriptures were given out, to make known his Will to Men; yet when *God* had given them a Revelation of his Will, by the Scriptures, he expected that every one, where this Revelation should come, should conform themselves to that Revelation, and honour it by Faith and Practice, as his Will. But tho' the generality of the Quakers do not own the Scriptures to be the *Word of God*, or the Rule of Faith and Worship, yet they own that their Light within (or their own strong Imagination) is the sufficient and infallible Rule. *I. Pennington* affirms, That *Directions taken out of the Scriptures, cannot be a Rule to true Christians.* If this be true, then his Brother *R. Barclay* is mistaken, in saying, that the Scriptures are a *secondary Rule*: One faith they a *Rule*, tho' not the Principal one; the other faith, they are no *Rule* at all. I don't wonder that the Spirit in them, contradicts it's self;
for,

for, I never yet could see any Reason to take it for the *Spirit of Truth*. But what may be the Reason why the Quakers do not call their *own* Writings by the Name of *Paper and Ink*? And why are they not equally careful, to caution carnal People, about reading of their *own* Writings; and say, "Friends, it is dangerous for you to read our Writings; take care you don't rest in the *Paper and Ink*, for our Writings are but Dust, Dung and Serpents Meat; if you stick in the Letter, it is dangerous to read them." There is no such Caution given about their own Epistles. But is it not as dangerous for a carnal Man to read your Books, as it is for the same sort of Men, to read the Scriptures? Pray tell us, what should be the Reason of the Danger, of such a Man's reading the Bible, more than one of *G. Fox's Books*? *W. Pen*, Spirit of Truth, p. 23. saith, *I will assure them (such as study the Scriptures) they shall yet grope in the dark, till they come into the daily Obedience of the Light (till they turn Quakers) and there rest contented, to know, only as they Experience.* His meaning seems to be this, That Men ought to let alone the study of the Scriptures, and all Scripture Account of things, both past and to come; all things that God has spoken to any Man, which is recorded in Scripture; and that Men should content themselves with what they now Experience, and neither look forward or backward. I believe this to be his meaning, to shut out the search of Scripture-History, Prophecies and Promises, and to turn Men to the Light within, which they make to serve instead of them all. But can any know the Order of *Creation*, or the Conduct of divine *Providence* towards his Church thro' all Ages, by Experience, without Scripture-History? Could *W. Penn*, or any of his Friends have known the History of the Life

Life and Death, Resurrection and Assention of Jesus Christ, with the blessed Fruits of his Death; or could they have known any thing of future Judgment, Heaven or Hell, by Experience, without the Scriptures? We believe the Scripture Account of these things, but we can't think it to be any Man's Duty to leave them out of his Thoughts, and out of his Religion, till he shall know them by his own Experience. On the contrary, God has called Men to employ their Thoughts about things that shall come to pass hereafter. Deut. 32. 29. *O that they were wise, that they understood this; that they would consider their latter End.* If it be a Man's *Wisdom* to consider his latter End, then it is his *Folly* to set aside the serious Thoughts thereof. So that *W. Penn's* Doctrine is unscriptural and foolish. If therefore your Light within speaks contrary to Scripture, we dare not obey it, nor should you; for we plainly see that it would lead us out of the way of our Duty, and therefore out of the way of Life.

PAGE 39, 40. *H. B.* makes Apology for *G. Fox* for calling the holy Scriptures *Dust, Dung, and Serpents Meat.* I must tell him, that he hath undertaken to wash the Black-Moor White. He confesses, "That he found those Expressions of *G. Fox* in one of the Pages, that I referred to." Very well, that's enough, and too often too, to have been written. But he saith "That the Author was writing to wicked Men, who yet lay Claim to Religion; and this, saith he, by a comparative way of speaking, he calls living upon *Dust*; that is not substantial Food, or Nourishment. And he says, *G. Fox* does not call the Scriptures *Dust, Dung, and Serpents Meat*, consider'd in themselves, but as carnal minded Men feed upon them, and content themselves with Reading, and unwarrantably applying the Ex-
perience

“ perience of good Men in those Days.” Friend, I must tell thee that this Apology Stinks ; for suppose that Drunkards should abuse the good Wine, their Excess in drinking does not make the Wine to be naught, tho’ they show themselves to be so. Or if a Man is guilty of Gluttony, his Sin does not alter the Property of the Food ; or if Men abuse the Lord’s Supper, that does not make it to become the *Table of Devils*, and the *Cup of Devils*, *Fr. Howgil. Pop. Inquis. p. 49.* So, if some wicked Men have abused the *holy Scriptures*, that does not alter the property of them, they are still *holy, just and good*. But we see, that upon all occasions, it is the *Scriptures* that *G. Fox* and his Friends fall out with. And some other Expressions, of like Nature, will explain and prove the Matter ; as you shall have them presently.

PAGE 40. He quotes 2 Cor. 3. 6. to shew that the Apostle himself used a like Expression, calling the Scriptures *the Letter*. *The Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life.* To this we answer, that the Law of God, is called the *Letter*, as it is separated from the Gospel and the Grace of it. The Law of the Ten Commandments was called the Letter, because it was engraven on Tables of Stone, (as the Apostle explains it in the next Words) This holy Law of God killeth, as it condemns Men for Sin, and shews fallen Men that they have destroy’d themselves ; that they are dead in Law. *John 3. 18. He that believeth not is condemned already.* *Gal. 3. 10. Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them.* Thus the Law is said to be a *Ministration of Condemnation*. The Law of God shews the Sinner no way of Pardon and Life, but the Spirit, the Gospel giveth Life ; the Gospel is called Spirit ; because it is a means in the Hand of the Spirit to bring Men from Darkness to Light, and the Gospel

Gospel giveth Life, as it brings *Life and Immortality to Light*; and also brings blind and dead Souls to Spiritual Light and Life, and to Faith in Jesus Christ. For these Reasons the Apostle called the Law, engraven in Letters upon Stone, with the Hand of God himself, by way of distinction from what was written by the Hands of Men; he calls this the *Letter*, which was no Mark of Contempt, as you may learn from his after Expressions, concerning the very same Law; namely, *that it was glorious*. But did you ever read that any Prophet, or Apostle, or any other Man of God, ever called the Scriptures, by such opprobrious Names, as *Dung, Dust, and Serpents Meat*! which *G. Fox* intended of the Gospel as well as of the Law; for he expressly mentions *Matthew, Mark, Luke and John*; which you know, are commonly called the Gospel. Do Men of the Nature of the Serpent, feed upon the Food that the Gospel brings? You may see further what Terms they give to the Scriptures: *Traditions of Men, Earthly Root, Darkness and Confusion, Nebuchadnezzar's Image, Putrefaction and Corruption; rotten and deceitful*. *Morning Watch, p. 22. 23.* *S. Fisher* speaks very highly of the Word *within*, or the Word in the *Heart*, or the Word which is written of, that not one Tittle of that Law shall fail; but he endeavours to render the Written-Word uncertain, contemptible and useless (as many of his Brethren have done.) *Rust. p. 241.* As to the Word of God, contained in the Scriptures, he speaks most contemptible of that, "As
 " allter'd, adulterated, wrested and torn, and like
 " a Nose of Wax, twisted and twined into twenty times twenty Shapes, tatter'd Translations,
 " corrupt Copies, a meer graven Image, and a
 " dead Letter, &c." What does all this tend to, but to set aside the Use of the holy Scriptures; and to set up their *Light within*, in Head of it.
 Which,

Which, they tell us, is sufficient to Salvation without any thing else. G. Whitehead Antid. p. 28.

I think we have seen enough of this Nature, to shew the fallacy of their Pretence of an high Esteem of the Scriptures. They mean the Scripture within, not the Bible. Before I dismiss this Head, I will leave a few Cautions with young Persons.

1. **TO** read the Scriptures daily, with some profitable Exposition. This is intended in that Charge of our Lord Jesus Christ. John 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures* — for want of which, we find much Ignorance about many necessary Truths, and fatal Perversion of Scripture.

2. **BE** not wanting in your daily Prayers to God in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Teaching of his Spirit, while you attend on the Use of God's appointed Means; that *he would open your Understanding to understand the Scriptures.*

3. **EVER** look on this Position as infallibly True, that those who slight the holy Scriptures, have never yet been taught of God: For the holy Spirit of God, where he dwells, ever carries out the Hearts of his People to love the Scriptures, and to esteem the written Word of God *above thousands of Gold and Silver; and more than their necessary Food.* And to *delight in the Law of God, after the inward Man.*

4. **BELIEVE** that the Scriptures are very necessary and useful for all Ages, Ranks and Degrees of Christians; notwithstanding the Light of Nature or Conscience. They are needful for such as are weak in Grace; to keep them from Sin. 1. John 2. 1. *My little Children these Things I Write unto you that you Sin not.* Such as know God have need of them, that by the Scriptures they may know him better. *These things I write unto you; because you have known the Father.* And those that

have the Pardon of their Sins, and know that their Sins are forgiven; yet need the Scriptures. *These things write I unto you, because your Sins are forgiven you.* The Writings of the Quakers speak quite contrary to these things: therefore they cannot be inspired of God, or write by the same Spirit that the Apostle *John* did.

5. HAVE a care of flighting any Part of the written Word of God. Prov. 13. 13. *He that despiseth the Word shall be destroyed.* And his own deceitful Heart and Unbelief shall be his Destroyers. He that will not receive the Truth in the Love of it, shall, in just Judgment, be given up to strong Delusion to believe a Lie. 2 Thes. 2. 11.

6. CONCLUDE that those poor Souls are under a fatal Delusion, that think the Scriptures to be of no real Use in Religion; that the Bible is no real Privilege to any Nation, where it comes; or that Men might serve God in a more spiritual Manner without it. Men without the Scriptures, are like *Israel* without a King; Every Man did that which was right in his own Eyes.

7. BE very careful to distinguish between outward Reformation and true Conversion; between the Change of Words or Garments, and the Change of the Heart. A Man also may change his Opinion once and again; and yet his Heart be never changed: such a Man does but set a *Piece of new Cloth into an old Garment.* From vain Men they may become Sober; and to this they may add some Formalities and Oddities of their own Inventions; and thus they may acquire a sort of Peace within, founded upon outward Reformation, and Change of Opinion, and Presumption of some good Works done by them, without regard to the Merits of our Saviour. Whereas there may be more Pride and Self-will, in their Change of Opinion, than may be perceived by themselves: Joyn-
ing

ing themselves to a despised People, may be no Self-denial; but rather the direct Way to gratify their Pride and Ambition: For hereby they, without any more ado, Commence Doctors and Teachers, which they thought themselves fit for before; but could bring it about, no other Way but by turning to the Quakers.

8. HAVE a care of taking up with a mere natural Religion; not founded upon divine Revelation; a Religion which can never discover the Saviour, that God has provided for lost Sinners. And a Religion which directs a convinced Sinner to look into himself, instead of looking out to Jesus Christ for Help, Righteousness, and Salvation. It is natural for proud Man to think to be his own Saviour. Man has destroyed himself, but *he cannot save himself*: Salvation is in *the Name of the Lord that made Heaven and Earth*. That Religion that teaches Men to look for Pardon and Salvation by their own Works [as *R. Barclay* and *S. Filber* Teach.] And not by the Merits of our Saviour; is a false Religion. A Man may turn from one Sin to another; and from the Practice of Sin, to trust in Self-Righteousness; or from Sin to Duties, and yet may be an utter stranger to true *Repentance towards God*, and *Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*; and to any Experience of a Work of real Holiness upon the Heart, thro' the washing of the Blood of Jesus, and Restoration of the Image of God upon the Soul.

9. CONCLUDE that it is not safe for you to hear such; who slight the Scriptures, neglect and speak against the Ordinances of the New-Testament. And trust to their own Works of Righteousness, which they have done, (tho' they own it done by Christ's Assistance) yet they are Works which they themselves have done; these are, by the Scriptures, utterly excluded from having any Place in the Article

of *Justification*, or any share in the Honour that is due only to the *Righteousness* of Christ, who trode the Wine-press of God's Wrath alone, and of the People there were none with him. — See how Works are excluded, in Justification. Tit. 3. 5. *Not by Works of Righteousness, which we have done, but by his Mercy he saved us. So, Eph. 2. 8, By Grace are ye saved, thro' Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God; not of Works, lest any Man should boast.* By gratifying your Curiosity, to hear such, you set your selves in the way of Temptation. *Their Words will eat as doth a Canker, of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus, who concerning the Truth (the Gospel) have erred; saying the Resurrection is past already, and overthrow the Faith of some, (that is the Doctrines, which should be believed.)* Therefore I will close this Head with that excellent Portion of Scripture. Prov. 19. 27. *Cease, my Son, to hear the Instruction (or Teaching) that causeth to Err from the Words of Knowledge.* That is, such Instruction that takes Men from the Use of the Holy Scriptures, which are the best Means of our obtaining the most Useful and needful Knowledge. And which being left, all their Light within, will leave Men utterly in the Dark, as to all the important Doctrines of the Christian Religion: For the Light within, is intirely silent, as to the Doctrines of Christ's Incarnation, his Life and Death, with the blessed Ends of it, and also his Resurrection and Assention; with the necessary Employment of Christ in Heaven. Search and look into all the Nations of the Earth, where the Scriptures have never come; view their differing Religions, and modes of Worship, and shew us, (if you can) which of all these Things the Light within has preached to them; for the Light within can teach Men no more than natural Reason, and Conscience teach; several of
the

the converted *Indians* have declared, *that they never had the least Hint of Christ among them, 'till the Gospel was preached to them by the Englishmen.*

A Man may be a Quaker-Christian, without knowing any thing of Christ's outward Birth, Life, and Death in the Flesh; *R. Barclay* owns it. Every Man that lives a moral, sober, honest Life, is a good Christian, in *W. Penn's* Account. If this be true, then Heathens might be good Christians, without the Knowledge or Faith of Christ. This is the Way to bring the Christian Religion upon the same Level with natural Religion, and render both the Birth and Death of Christ needless, and our Enjoyment of the Scriptures, no privilege at all.— But with them this is a small Matter; for some of them have affirmed, that they believe that the Scriptures were rather a *Hindrance*, than an *Help* to Religion; And, *not the best and most effectual Means to bring Men to Repentance.* *Rust.* p. 549.

II. WE cannot judge the Quakers to be sound in Doctrine by their mentioning the Words of Scripture: It is the Exposition of Scripture that shews a Man to be sound or not sound, and this must be learnt from the Testimonies they have given in other Places; we do not contend about the Words of Scripture, but about the *false Glosses*, which they put upon the Words, asserting, that now Christ is come, the Scriptures are at an End. *Gr. m.* p. 110. 311. *In Christ the Scripture Ends*; And they are bewitched that make the Scriptures their Rule of Life. *E. Burroughs*, p. 105. *You are in the Witchcraft, that observe Commands from without, from the Letter*; and he intimates that the Spirit of God does not speak by the Scripture. *G. F. Gr. m.* p. 280.

C H A P. III.

Of the Light Within.

BEFORE *H. B.* proceeds to consider what had been said in the REVIEW concerning the Light within, he takes Care like a Pioneer, to clear the Way, by charging the Author of the REVIEW with want of Charity, Understanding, Distinction, Strength of Argument, of Justice, and common Honesty; upon which accounts, he saith, the REVIEWER has intirely forfeited his Credit. I suppose I have forfeited my Credit, with you, and so does every honest Man, that dares to be so bold as to meddle with your darling Notion of the Light within: But I cannot grieve for losing that which I never had; or ever affected to have. But what will you do to retrieve your own, and the Credit of your Cause? For it is very evident that you have forfeited your own Credit, by your false Reports concerning my Quotations; and your Friends also have forfeited theirs, by false Reports of their Discourse with me, as the Witnesses have testified; but let us go on to take Notice of *R. Barclay's* account of the Light within.

HE saith, *That God hath communicated and given unto every Man, a Measure of the Light of his own Son, a measure of Grace, or a measure of the Spirit, which the Scriptures express by several Names; as the Seed of the Kingdom; the Light that makes all Things manifest; the Word of God, or the Manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal, p. 138. A Spiritual, invisible Principle, in which God, as Father, Son, and Holy*

Holy Ghost dwells, a measure of which divine and glorious Life is in all Men. Now, *H. B.* quarrels with the *REVIEWER*, for calling the *Light* within a *Creature*, and an *imperfect Creature*. And he saith, "It is an unfair Conclusion from what *R. Barclay* had said, such as his Words will not bear, and such as none but an avowed Enemy, and one most averse to Truth would have been guilty of: Can an Heavenly Principle, saith he, be a Creature?" I answer, if he, or you will call the *Light* within, sometimes by the Name of an immutable, eternal Principle, God and the Spirit, and at other Times, say it is a measure of the Spirit, and a measure of Grace; you must take the Contradiction upon your selves; for can that be unchangeable that tells a Man now he must *imbrace*, and by and by, he must *change* his Doctrines and mode of Worship, for such as differ as much as *Light* and *Darkness*; and yet the Man obeys that *Light*, both in the one, and in the other: And if the *Light* within be a *measure* of the Spirit, and a *measure* of Grace, then it can neither be Christ or the Spirit, at best it can be but some Gift of, or from the Spirit; and if it be the *Seed* of the Kingdom, then it can be nothing *perfect*, for the Scripture saith, that the *Seed groweth up*, therefore is not *perfect*, 'till it is grown up, and it is not grown up while it remains to be *Seed*; and if it be *something in which God as Father, Son and Spirit dwells*; then it cannot be God, Father, Son or Spirit, and then it is Idolatry to worship it. But to compleat their Definition of the *Light* within; *E. Batburst* saith, "That the *Light* within is something of the Nature and Being of God himself." (*p. 67. and 42.*) "The *Light* within is the Principle of divine *Light* and *Life* of Christ, placed in the Conscience: it is the Grace that bringeth Salvation, that hath appeared to all Men; and it

" is

" is that Word of his Grace which is able to build
 " us up." Thus they make it to be a *Part of God*
 himself, and very God ; and they make it to be the
 same with the Gospel, for they say it is *the Grace*
that bringeth Salvation, and that it is able to build
us up, and they make it to be the same with Christ
 and his Merits ; for they say by *which Grace we are*
called justified and saved. And p. 53. It is that
 by which Men may be put into a Capacity of receiv-
 ing the Grace of God, in the Gifts thereof. Here's a
 Contradiction, with a Witness ! They said before,
 That it is an *Heavenly divine Principle* ; something
 of the *very Nature of God himself*, and a *Principle of*
the divine Light, and Life of Christ ; it is *Christ* ; it is
 the *Spirit* ; and a *measure of Grace*, and a *measure*
of the Spirit : And now they say, that it is some-
 thing that *qualifies Men to receive the Grace of God*,
 p. 55. They say, *It is not Conscience*, for that is a
created faculty. By which Expression you may learn
 again, that they hold the Light within to be in-
 created ; and if it is not created, then it is the Crea-
 tor, for there is no medium between these two
 Terms, it must be one or the other ; whatsoever is
 not created is God. Again, they say *it hath its Be-*
ing from all Eternity ; if that were True, then the
 Light within must needs be God. Again, p. 59. 60.
 It is the *Grace of God* : Just now it was *God*, now
 it is the *Grace of God* ; that is, a Gift of, or from
 God. Again, they say it is *that Stone which has*
been rejected by many foolish Builders, but now is
become the Head of the Corner : And the Light with-
 in, is that *Prophet*, which all that hear not him,
 are to be cut off, p. 66. Thus they put the
 Light within in the Place of Christ ; so does G.
 Fox, Gr. m. p. 230. *The Light which is the Covenant*
of God, that doth enlighten every Man that cometh
into the World discovers Sin ; makes it manifest ; blots
it out ; justifies, sanctifies, redeems, and condemns
them

them that hate it. Again, the **Light** which hath enlightened every **Man** that is come into the **World** is *the Saviour*, and no **Man** is condemned, but for not believing in that **Light**, and no **Man** is saved, but who believes in that **Light**. (Gr. Myst. p. 277.) But perhaps *H. B.* will say, that *G. Fox* intended all this of the *same Christ*, that is at the right **Hand** of **God**. I answer, if they will deal fairly, they must consider upon what **Occasion** *G. Fox* spake these **Words**

Mr. Mabew had said, "That no **Man** can be saved, that has no other **Light** than the **Light** "within." And the **Affertion** is true; for the **Light** within cannot discover **Jesus Christ**, and **God's** way of **Justification** and **Salvation** of **Sinners**. But *G. Fox* answered him in the **Words** just before quoted, whereby it appears, that he meant it of the **Light** in themselves, not of **Jesus Christ**; for if he had intended it of **Christ** in **Heaven**, all that he said was impertinent. But how can **Heathens** be said to have this divine and heavenly **Principle**, this **Christ**, this **Spirit of God**, and this measure of **Grace**? When the **Scriptures** plainly assert, that **Men** by **Nature**, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, are all without **God**, and without **Christ** in the **World**. Eph. 4. 18. *Having the Understanding darkned* (where is the **Light** within then?) *And aliens from the Life of God* (where's the divine **Life** then?) *Thro' the Ignorance that is in them, because of the Blindness of their Heart.* Then where is the **Light** within every **Man**? When every **Man** by **Nature** is in a **State of Darkness**, and **Ignorance** in their **Hearts**. Eph. 2. 12. *That at that Time, (before they received the Scriptures) ye were without Christ, and without God in the World.* What! can every **Man** have **Christ**, the **Spirit**, a measure of **Grace**, and measure of the divine **Fulness**, and yet be without **Christ**, and without **God** in the **World**? Account

for these Contradictions, if you can! *S. Fisher* saith, *That all Men have the Light of the Gospel within them*, p. 598. How then can all the Nations of the Earth (which have not the Scriptures) be said to sit in *Darkness* and in the *shadow of Death*? He also saith, *That the Light within is the Scripture*, and calls it *Moses* and the *Prophets*. He that will not hear this *Moses* and the *Prophets*, that is so nigh him, that is within him, will never be profited, or perswaded by any Man's *Writings*, nor any *Preachings*, that are further off from him, or without him, *Rust*. p. 551. "And that they are not ashamed to set the *Light within* above the *Letter without*; and "to say, that it is not in as much, but in more "Authority than the *Scriptures*." By calling the *Light within* by the Name of the *Scripture*, the *Spirit* and *Christ*; they make the *Spirit* and the *Revelation* of the *Mind* of the *Spirit* to be the same Thing: Then the *King* is his *Proclamation*, and the *Proclamation* is the *King*, this is absurd, Page 785. He adds, *The Light within is the perfect Law of Liberty*.

THUS you see that they make the *Light within* to be *God*, *Christ*, the *Spirit*, *Law* and *Gospel*; they say, "That the *Light within* is sufficient to "Salvation, without the *Scriptures*." *Gr. Myst.* p. 47. Thus they make the *Scriptures* needless. Again, they say, that "All *Power* in *Heaven* and *Earth* "is in it." *Sm. Prim.* p. 14. Then it will follow, that all *Power* in *Heaven* and *Earth* is in every *Quaker*; and in every *Heathen*, for they say that those also, are born with the *Light within*. Again, "They say, the *Light within* is the very same "Christ, that came from *Heaven*, and suffered without "the *Gates of Jerusalem*." Then the *Light within* must have a *Body of Flesh* to suffer, and *Blood* to shed, and then there is one *Body* in another; and *Christ* has so many *Bodies* as there are *Quakers* in the

the World. But if the Light within has no body of Flesh and Blood, then it cannot be that very Christ, who took our Nature, our very Flesh and Blood *Heb. 2. 14.* Of the fleshly Seed of *Abraham* and *David*, and was born of the Virgin. If the Light within be not this Christ, it can be no Saviour for the Sons of *Adam*; it is not that Christ who is our near Kinsman, and in whom lay the right of Redemption. Their Light within can be neither God nor Man; not *Man*, because it has neither Flesh and Blood, nor an human Soul: They call it a spiritual Body which came down from Heaven, and the Light within cannot be *God*, because they say it is a measure of Grace, and a measure of the Spirit; and if it is neither God nor Man, then it cannot be Jesus Christ, for he is both God and Man.

SOME of the Quakers have said that the Light within is the very same as Christ without; but they are not all agreed: Else why were the Quakers so angry with *George Keith* in *Philadelphia* as to put him in Prison, for preaching the necessity of Faith in Christ *without*, as well as Christ *within*? These Men had been taught by *G. Fox* a very contrary Doctrine, who said, (*Gr. Myst. p. 250.*) *The Devil was in thee, and thou saith thou art saved by Christ without thee; and so hath recorded thy self to be a Reprobate.* (*And Sm. Prim. p. 9.*) *They are false Ministers that Preach Christ without.* And *Chr. Atkinson* says, *Your imagined God beyond the Stars, and your carnal Christ is utterly deny'd, Sw. dr. p. 5.* (*H. B. says, p. 46.*) *By the Grace of God we mean the Gift of our Lord Jesus Christ for the Redemption of Men; and when we speak of Grace in the Heart, we mean the Operation of the Spirit, by which the new Creature is brought forth.*

IF this be a Distinction among you, it is no Scripture Distinction: We own that as Jesus Christ

is a *free Gift* of God, so he may be called *Grace*, as also because he is the Fountain and Efficient of it; yet because the Scriptures teach us to call every free and undeserved Gift (for Body or Soul) by the Name of *Grace*, therefore so do we; the Term is not ours but God's. We also call the Spirit's Working upon the Soul, with the Effects of his Working, by the Name of *Grace*; and it must needs be so, unless the Soul which is wrought upon, may be supposed (as *Sam. Fisher* does,) to *deserve* that which is wrought in, done for, and given to them. But *H. B.* saith, that to call the new Creature by the Name of *Grace*, is unfairly to suggest, that the Cause and the Effect are the same. Verily this Confusion is not to be laid at my Door; you never learn'd from me, that *Christ* the Author of *Grace*, and his *Work of Grace* upon the Soul, are one and the same Thing; but any one may learn it from your own confused Terms. Thus we learn that if the Light within, be as dark as their Definition, *there is no Light in them*, but the imperfect Fragments of elapsed Nature. Page 47. He says, "That I do not understand the Meaning of the Word *Grace*; for saith he, How can a Man have any *Grace* of his own?" To this I answer, "That *Grace* is any free Gift, Work, or Fruit of the Good-will, or Favour of God, or of Christ, wrought in, or given to an undeserving Creature," and for its Kind, is the same with *Mercy*, and is differenced not from the Giver or Worker, or from the Thing its self, but with respect to the Receiver: then it is *Mercy* when it meets with a miserable Creature; and then it is *Grace* when it meets with an undeserving Creature: These therefore are put together in one Verse. Heb. 4. 16. *Let us come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain Mercy, and find Grace to help in Time of need.*

Now

Now, is not this mine when God has given it to me, or wrought it in me? If God has given me the Grace of *Faith*, is it not mine? Or if the Grace of *Repentance*, is it not mine? But now you shall have *H. B.*'s own Definition of Grace; Grace (saith he,) is the Operation of the Spirit by which the new Creature is brought forth. This is a very halting Definition indeed! If that be all that is intended in the Word *Grace*, then the Fruits of the Spirit, as *Faith, Love, Meekness, Temperance, Patience, &c.* are no Graces: No, but according to him, Grace is the Operation of the Spirit; so unhappy is he in his Definition. Faith, by which we believe in Christ, is called *Grace*. Eph. 2. 8. By *Grace* ye are saved thro' *Faith*, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God. And all the Fruits of the Spirit are so many Graces, as they are the free Gifts of God to us. Page 47, 48. *H. B.* seems to make no Distinction between a Man's believing, that there is a measure of Grace in Men, and believing in that measure of Grace. These two Things very widely differ, for the Former is only giving *Credit*, that there is such a thing in the Hearts of Men; the Latter is a *Trusting* in that measure of Grace, which is supposed to be in the Soul.

Now, if the Word *Grace* had never been used in Scripture, to signify any thing but *Christ* or the Spirit, I should never blame any Man for calling upon others to believe in that Grace; but it is manifest that the Word *Grace* is very often used in Scripture, to signify the *Fruits* of the Spirit, wrought in and given to the Souls of Men, in order to fit them for the Service and Enjoyment of God. Joh. 1. 16. Of his fulness have we all received, and Grace for Grace. But *H. B.* saith, "That they do not call upon Men to believe in any *Grace, Favour* or *Goodness* of their own, but in the Lord Jesus *Christ*." We answer, that Grace in the Heart, tho'

tho' it is wrought by the Spirit of God, may be called our own; for tho' it is not of our implanting, yet the Act is ours, as well as the Habit from whence we Act, it is not the Spirit or Christ that believes in us, but *with the Heart Man believeth*: If Faith wrought in my Heart is not mine, whose is it? *It is given to you to believe.*

BUT H. B. finds fault, that I call *Grace a Creature*. He saith; "I might as well say that the *Lord from Heaven is a Creature, and an imperfect Creature.*" I must tell you that your Friend Wm. Penn was guilty of as great Absurdity, in saying, that *Jesus Christ is no more than a moral Virtue*; and then I am sure he is but a Creature. How weak is the pretended Reasoning of this poor Man! He saith that I may as well call the Lord Jesus Christ, the Author of all Grace, by the Name of an imperfect Creature, as to call his Work of Grace so. No sure, there is a vast difference between him, in whom all fulness dwells, and any Work of his upon the best of his Creatures; even as there is a difference between the Ocean and the Streams; or between the Body of the Sun, and his Rayes of Light; or between the Fountain and the Cistern.

BUT I affirm that Grace in the Heart is a mere Creature, and at present but an imperfect Creature; and room is left in the Best, to pray for its Growth and Increase: But if it were true as you say, "That the divine and heavenly Principle of the Light within is perfect." Then you have no need to pray, nay, you cannot pray, as the People of God have done in all Ages past; you cannot confess your Sins, and pray for Pardon, as they used to do; you cannot say as the Disciples, *Lord increase our Faith, or, Lord help my unbelief*; you have no need of a Throne of Grace, to come to for Mercy and Grace to help in Time of need, for you have no such Time of need: You say that you are rich and increased in Goods,

Goods, and have need of nothing. It is no privilege as to your own Persons, that God has stiled himself, the *God bearing Prayer*. And it is of little or no service to you, that Jesus Christ is an *Advocate with the Father*, for such as Sin thro' Weakness: for you hold that you are perfect; and then it follows from your Principles, that you live without Sin; you serve God as well as you *should* do, and as well as you *desire to* do; you have no *wandering Thoughts* in Time of Duty; no disorderly *Affections* and *Passions*; no unthankfulness in your *Hearts*; and you are as fruitful in good Works as you should be; and as holy as the Law of God requires you to be. Then your Prayers will be like the Prayer of the Pharisee; *God I thank thee that I am better than other Men*. That Prayer had no Confession or Petition in it, and all because he was an utter stranger to the Spirituality of the Law of God; to his own Sinfulness; his many Wants; and to God's Way of Justification and Salvation.

PAGE 51. *H. B.* blames the Author of the REVIEW for saying, that *R. Barclay* confessed that when they call upon Men to believe in Christ, they mean it of the *Light within*. And he saith, "That he has searched diligently, and cannot find any such Place in *R. Barclay's Apology*." And accordingly, he sets this down in his Catalogue of false Charges against their Friends. But this Matter stands fair, p. 180. *Edit 4*. In these very Words, "We are moved of the Lord to call all, to invite all, to request all, to turn to the Light in them, and to believe in the Light in them; this, (*saith he,*) is what the Scriptures call the new Man, and the Christ within; this is that Christ within, which we are heard so much to speak of, and to preach him up, and exhorting People to believe in the Light." Thus you see I have done

done him no Wrong, but he thinks it Answer enough to say he cannot find it.

Now observe how widely the Quakers Divinity differs from what we learn from the holy Scriptures; when convinced Sinners asked the Apostles *What must we do to be saved?* Their Answer was, *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* And this agrees with the Language of Jesus Christ himself; *Isai. 45. 22. Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye Ends of the Earth: for I am God and there is none else. And verse 24. Even to him shall Men come.* But if the same Question was put to the Quakers, they do not direct Men to look out, or to look up to Heaven, to *Jesus Christ*; but to turn inward, and look into themselves, believe in the *Light within*, obey the *Light within*. But a Soul truly enlightned, would be ready to say, Ah! Friend, I have looked there already till my Heart akes, and am ready to sink in Despair; for I see nothing in my self but Sin, Guilt, Filth and Misery, I see *I have destroyed my self, but cannot help and save my self, I looked within and there was none to help*; and if I can find Help no where else, I am undone, and shall be eternally Miserable. And you shall see that God himself has said the same. *Isai. 63. 5. I looked and there was none to help; then mine own Arm brought Salvation.* The Condition of fallen Man needs Help, but he cannot help himself, neither can any mere Creature in Heaven or Earth help him; none but God's Arm, Jesus Christ, who is at the Right-Hand of God, and who is both God and Man, can help and save lost Sinners.

WHEN the Israelites were stung with fiery Serpents, God directed them, not to look within themselves, and believe in the *Light within*; but to look out, and to look up to the brazen Serpent, which was a Type of Jesus Christ, and their looking to it, was a Figure of convinced Souls looking up to

to Jesus Christ, by the Eye of Faith, for the Healing of their Soul's Diseases. The Reason is plain; because *our help must come from the Name of the Lord that made Heaven and Earth*, Psal. 124. 8. We dare not look for help to the Light within; because that is not the Lord that made Heaven and Earth. We believe that Jesus Christ, who is with his glorified Body, now at the Right-Hand of God, is that Lord that created Heaven and Earth; and also that he is called the *True Light*, and that *he lighteth every Man that cometh into the World*; but that the Light which he gives to any Man, is the very Christ of God, and Saviour of the World, or is the Object of Faith; this we utterly deny, because (as you have said) we must distinguish between the Cause and the Effect. And if you did so too, much of our Dispute would be at an End, and it would sapp the very Foundation of Quakerism. But the Quakers call Men to believe in Christ, and mean not the Christ at the Right-Hand of God, but the Christ within; Just thus have some pretended to beat up for Men, to enter into the Service of King GEORGE, but intend them for the Service of the Pretender. So you beat up in your speaking and writing for Volunteers to serve under Christ, and enlist them in the Service of the Light within, which I look upon to be no better than a Pretender, set up in the Room of King Jesus.

IF H. B. should say, that I have endeavoured to make People believe that they make the Light, or Christ within, to be differing from Christ in Heaven: I answer, so you do, and I prove it from Wm. Smith's Primer p. 36. *They that preach Christ without, and bid Men believe in him, are false Ministers; but the true Ministers of Christ, are such as preach Christ within.* Then according to him, the two Christs must differ, as much as their differing Mi-

nistry ; that is, that the *Christ within* is the *true Christ*, and the *Christ without* is the *false Christ* ; the Conclusion is very natural and just. And this may well agree with that Assertion of *G. Fox*. *Gr. Myst.* p. 206. *If there be any other Christ but he that was crucified within, he is the false Christ.* *H. B.* saith, " That when *R. Barclay* calls Men to believe in the " Light within, they mean the Manifestation of " the Spirit of Christ, and he hopes that is no " Error." I answer, that if this Manifestation you talk of, is no other than some Gift from Christ, it is Idolatry to believe in, and to Worship it ; you might as lawfully worship and believe in the Sun, Moon and Stars, as believe in that Light. Tho' we believe that there is such a Thing as the Light within, yet we must not believe in it. It is not the Object of Faith, for so it is but an Idol of your own setting up.

PAGE 52. *H. B.* takes an Inference from p. 20. and endeavours to fasten Inconsistency upon the REVIEWER ; whereas the REVIEWER had only taken the Quakers own Words, and drawn a very just Inference from them, and it was this. *That for as much as they affirm. that every Man has the Light within, and also call this Light by the Name of the Spirit of God ; I said that the just Consequence of their own Assertion is, that every Man has the Spirit of God.* What can be plainer and fairer ? What Fault is in the Conclusion (as indeed it is against the Scripture,) let them take it upon themselves, for every thing is easiest in its own Centre

PAGE 53. He saith that *I have made Christ four sorts of Lights*, he teigns it out of Page the 20, 21. There I had referred to *John* 1. 9. that *Jesus Christ lighteth every Man that cometh into the World ; some with the Light of Nature ; others with divine Revelation ; others with saving Light of Grace ; and all Men with the Light of Conscience.* But that *Jesus Christ,*

Christ, the true Light lighteth every Man with true or saving Grace, cannot be gathered from that Scripture.

Now who but a Caviller would have said that I made Jesus Chrst four Sorts of Lights; As if I had confounded Jesus Christ and his Gifts; or had made Jesus Christ and his Benefits to be the same thing; as they do in calling the Light within by the Name of Christ. I cannot see how any Man with Brains and Honesty could have been Guilty of such an Oversight; who might see that my Design was to help them, if I could, duely to distinguish between Christ and his Gifts; so we have heard that when the Thief has been like to be apprehended he has attempted to thrust his stolen Goods into another's Pocket. Thus *H. B.* would obtrude his spurious Stuff upon me, but he is detected in his attempt, I wish he may be ashamed.

PAGE 56. He endeavours to fasten another Absurdity upon the REVIEW; (for you may observe that his Talent lies very much this Way.) Because I had said that the *Quakers* sometimes affirm the Light within to be *God*; sometimes to be a *Creature*. *H. B.* falsely charges that Errour upon me; (whereas any indifferent Reader may plainly see, that I observed it, as their own Judgment and Confession,) this is far from honest Dealing. Yet saith he "I suppose he must make some notable Distinction, when he confounds Grace with God, and God and Grace with a Creature, an imperfect Creature." How dishonest is this Charge? when all along, I repeated *their own Words*; I told them, that *R. Barclay* called upon Men to believe in the *Light*, therefore he must of Necessity own the *Light* to be *God*; the Reason is, because none but the *true God* is to be believed in: We should not be called upon by the Scriptures to believe in *Jesus Christ*, if he was not *very God*. But sometimes they call the Light

within, a measure of the Spirit, and the Seed; thereby they shew the Light within to be a Creature. And when I blamed this Inconsistency in their Opinion, *H. B.* very unjustly drops his spurious Brat at my Door.

PAGE 58, 59. He maintains that the Light within is to be worshipped; if saith he, the *divine Light*, which is *Christ* and *God* is not to be worshipped, then I know not who is the proper Object of Worship. We answer, that the true *God* is to be worshipped, none deny; and also that *Jesus Christ* who is the *Eternal Son of God* is to be worshipped, all true Christians own; for *God* will have all *Men* to honour the *Son*, even as they honour the *Father*. But to worship the *Light* of *Christ* in *Men*, instead of *Christ* himself who is in *Heaven*, is but to set up an *Idol* in *Men's* own *Hearts*, which *God* himself complains of, *Ezek.* 14. 3. *Son of Man*, these *Men* have set up their *Idol* in their *Heart*.

BUT when *H. B.* saith, p. 46. *Can a heavenly Principle be a Creature?* I suppose the poor *Man* mistakes the Word, and takes *Principle* to be the same as *Principal*; the latter signifies one in *Chief Place* or *Government*. Thus he seems to argue, "Can the heavenly *Principal*, who is *God* or *Christ* be a *Creature*? But this is just as infallible *George* mistook *Mr. Baxter*, reading *External* for *Eternal*. This is not the Word we have to do with, but the Word *Principle*, which, tho' it be like the other in sound, yet signifies no more than an *Element*, or *Rudiment*, or *Ground* of any thing; as *A. B. C.* or as an *Accidence* or *Grammer-Rules*, are *Rudiments* or *Principles* of any *Language*; So *Artis Principia*, are *Principles* of any *Art*.

THUS I am willing to teach you your *A. B. C.*; had you understood the Word *Principle*, you need not have said, "Can an heavenly *Principle* be a *Creature*?" Yes, it may, and if you had not been

too ignorant of the Scriptures, you might have learnt it there also, that the Word *Principle* signifies something else besides *God* or *Christ*; and therefore I may well apply that Expression to you, *Heb. 5. 12. Ye have need that one teach you again which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God; and are become such as have need of Milk, and not of Strong Meat; for every one that useth Milk is unskilful in the Word of Righteousness; for he is a Babe.* These Principles are explain'd (what they are) *ch. 6. 1.* That they are not *God* or *Christ*, as *H. B.* saith, but the *Doctrines* of the Scriptures. Therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrines of *Christ*, let us go on to *Perfection*; and not lay again the *Foundation*; or treat again of the first Principles; and those are the *Doctrines* of *Repentance from Dead Works and Faith towards God, and of Baptisms; and of laying on of Hands; and of the Resurrection of the Dead; and of eternal Judgment.*

Now, will *H. B.* say that these are not heavenly Principles? Then I hope he will see his Errour, that every heavenly Principle is not *God* and *Christ*, but the Creature of *God*; therefore not to be Worshipped.

In the same Page *H. B.* was even frightened to hear such a Charge against *G. Fox*, that they have taught, "That the Light within is a more sure Guide than the Law of *God*." For the standing Law of *God* is, Thou shalt not Steal; but against this Commandment, *G. Fox* vindicates a Man that stole the Hour-Glass out of the Church, saying, *As for any being moved of the Lord to take away your Glass from you, by the eternal Power, it is owned.* Observe that this Man is said to be moved by the Lord, or is supposed to do it by the eternal Power: And what can be his meaning in those Words, *it is owned*; but that he approved of the Fact, or justified it, as done in Obedience

bedience to the Light within; is not this to dispence with the Laws of God, even at their Pleasure? Or as often as any one's strong Imagination shall prompt him to do any thing sinful; then there would be no Sin in the World. Thus, as the Pharisees *made void the Law of God by their Traditions*, so these Men take a ready Course to make the Law of God void by their *enthusiastic Fictions*; the same eternal Power, as they call it, has sent some to deliver certain false Messages, as you have heard; but you take Care to smother the Circumstances of them, which would shew the Delusion of those that pretend to be moved, as you call it, by the eternal Power. You say "That you were frightened at this Assertion, " that your Friends should be charged with setting up the Light within, as a more sure Guide than the Law of God." Were you chosen by your Friends, or did your own Spirit move you, to appear as an Advocate for the Quakers Principles; and yet a stranger to one of their main Principles? What! scar'd at what you must needs have often heard and seen! Is this possible? Did you never hear that your chief Leaders have called the Scriptures, *an human Testimony? Paper and Ink; Dust and Dung*; and that *they are no Rule at all to the Saints*? Are you such a Novice in the Quakers-Principles, as not to know these things? If you are a true Quaker, you need not be scared at it, for it has been asserted by some of your dear Friends and Champions; *Rust. p. 551.* "The Quakers are not ashamed to set the Light within above the Letter without, and to say that it is not in as much, but in more Authority than the Scriptures." Thus you see that I have not falsely accused you. I wish you were frightened out of this dangerous Errour, and it would be your Mercy.

N. B.

N. B. BEFORE I leave this Page, I must desire the Reader to correct an Oversight in the REVIEW, Page 22. Line 14. Blot out these Words, (*and said also*) and instead of them, write the Words following (*whence one inferred that*) and then they stand no longer for G. Fox's Words, as they were represented in the REVIEW, but as a just Inference from them.

BEFORE I dismiss this Chapter, I will make a few Remarks upon it, for the Assistance of the Reader.

I. IF the Light within be a *Manifestation* of the Spirit, and this *Manifestation* is in *every Man*, then I infer, that it can be no *Special Gift*; it is but a *common Priviledge*. It is not that *Special Manifestation*, whereby God distinguishes good from wicked Men. This *Manifestation*, what ever it be, is given to *Unbelievers* as well as *Believers*; therefore it can be no heavenly, no saving Gift. We read, *John 14. 21, 22.* of such a *Manifestation*, as *the World* has nothing to do with. *Lord how is it, that thou wilt manifest thy self to us, and not unto the World?* Now that cannot be intended of the *common Manifestation*, or *Light within*; for every *Man* that comes into the *World* has that *Manifestation*. Therefore we justly conclude that there is some further and better *Manifestation* than the *Light within*.

II. IF the *Light within* were, as they say, *the Law of God written in the Heart*, would it not encline them to love the written *Word of God*? For that's one needful *Mercy* promised, *I will write my Laws in their Hearts*, *Ezek. 36. 26.* And then, could they speak so contemptibly of the *Scriptures*? If the *Light within* be the *Law of God written in the Heart*, and yet the *Light* is in

in every Man, this contradicts the Scripture last quoted. God make a Promises of writing his Laws in the Hearts of some; that implies, that the Laws of God are not there, in the Manner that God intends, 'till he writes his Laws there; and God's writing his Laws in the Heart, is his giving Men a *good Understanding* of them; an *Heart-Approbation* of them; a *Love* to and *Delight* in them; and *good Disposition* of Soul to keep them. And not only to obey, but to be able to say (as every gracious Soul can do) *I delight in the Law of God after the inward Man. I delight to do thy Will, O God; the Reason is, Thy Law is within my Heart.* Now I ask, Does every one that comes into the World, *understand* the Laws of God a-right? If so, how are all Men, by Nature said to be in *Darkness*, and blinded with Ignorance in their *Minds*? And does every Man *approve of, consent unto, and love the Law of God*? And has every one a *good Disposition* of Soul to *keep and do the Laws of God*? Surely they must be strangers to themselves and all the Human Race, that can approve of this wild Notion. Then, whatever the Light within is, it cannot be the *Law of God written in the Heart*, but the Fragments of the Law of Nature, which the Heathens are all said to have. *Rom. 2. 14, 15.* The Light within is something *Connatural* to Men, it is no Supernatural Gift, but something that every Man is born with. But God's Promise of *writing his Laws in the Heart*, is a Super-added Gift, to all the Light that Men are born with.

III. **THEY** call the Light within the *Word of God*. And so they give it the Title that they will not allow to the Scriptures: Therefore, by their way of arguing, the Light within must be the *Essential Word of God*; and then it must be *Infinite*

finite in all divine Perfections ; and consequently the Light within is to be Worshiped ; for Jesus Christ is the Object of divine Worship : But we are at a loss, whether I must Worship the Light, as it is in my self, or as it is in a Brother or Sister. But they call the Light within the *Word of God*, with intent, by degrees, to shut the *Written-Word* out of the World.

IV. THEY call the Light within, by the Name of the *Gospel* ; the *Word of the Kingdom* ; the *Word of Faith* ; the *ingrafted Word* ; this *Light within* is the *Gospel* ; the *Gospel* is this inward *Power and Life* ; which preaches glad Tidings in the Hearts of Men. To all which we answer, that if the Light within were the *Gospel*, then it would preach *Jesus Christ*, who is exalted, a Prince and a Saviour, at the right Hand of God ; for that's the chief design of the *Gospel Ministry*. But Christ above, Christ in Heaven, Christ without, Christ God-Man is commonly opposed by your Light within, therefore it cannot be the *Gospel* that the Apostle *Paul* preached ; and if it be another, the Preachers of it are *accursed*, Gal. 1 8. Now observe, that while they call the Light within by the Names of *Law* and *Gospel*, they confound both ; and when they call it *Christ* and a *Manifestation* of Christ, is it not unpardonable Confusion ? Is the King and his *Proclamation* the same thing ? And if the Light within be the *Gospel*, how comes it not to preach *Jesus Christ* to the Heathens, where the Scriptures have not come ? How comes your *Gospel* to lye a Sleep in so many Millions of Souls, and never preach *Christ* to any one Man ? What is your *Gospel* a dumb *Gospel* ? And if this *Gospel* of the Light within, be in every one, how are Men said to perish for lack of Vision, where the written Word does not

N

come ?

come? What! have Men an infallible Light and Guide within, and the Gospel within, and Christ and the Spirit and Grace within, and yet in a perishing Condition? And if the Light within is the Gospel, then we ask, Are the Scriptures, and Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God the same thing? And for as much as they say that the Light within is *increated*, and a *Part of God himself*; and yet the Light within is the *Gospel*; then we ask how they make out, that *God himself* and the *Gospel* are the same thing? And how the *Law of God* and the *Gospel* were from *Eternity*? And how is it true, that *Life and Immortality* are brought to *Light by the Gospel*? That is the written Word of God. And we ask you, what one Gospel-Truth has your Light within ever revealed, that the Scriptures have not reported before? Now as God once said, to discover the Fiction and Deceit of former Idols, so say I to you, concerning your Gospel, or Light within, by which you pretend to know all necessary things. Isa. 41. 21. 24. *Produce your Cause, saith the Lord, bring forth your strong Reasons, saith the King of Jacob, let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen; let them shew the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter End of them; or declare us things to come; shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods; yea do good or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together: Behold ye are of nothing, and your work of nought, an Abomination is he that chooseth you.*

V. THEY call the Light within by the Name of the Spirit, as they often affirm that the Spirit is in every Man, then I ask you to reconcile this common Opinion, with that Affirmation of G. Fox, Great Myst. p. 91. *So the Light being turned to be*
receives

receiveth the Spirit of God, which sanctifies him. Is the Light within before the Spirit of God be there? For he saith that we must turn to the Light, in order to our receiving the Spirit. And E. Batburst saith, that the Light within qualifies or prepares any one to receive the Grace of God. So that, by their own Words, the Light within, is neither Grace nor the Spirit of God. Can a Man turn to the Light before he has received the Spirit? Then the Light within, is not the Spirit. Must he turn into himself as a means to obtain the Spirit? Then the Spirit of God is not there before. And how then, is the Spirit in every Man that comes into the World? If the Spirit be in every Man, what Spirit can that be that teaches them to slight the Scriptures? Which many have done, after they pretended to follow the Spirit, in turning to Quakerism, more than they had done before. But do you suppose such can possibly be led by the Spirit of God, who gave out the Scriptures; or by a contrary Spirit? And what Spirit can that be that makes a Man more averse to the Work of Prayer than before he turn'd to Quakerism? Can that be the Spirit of Grace in Supplications? What Spirit can that be that puts Men upon railing at good Men, only because they differ in Opinion from themselves? The Spirit of God has charged us, not to render Railing for Railing. T.C. little thought what Spirit he was of, when he was so lavish in his Expressions; but out of the abundance of the Heart, the Mouth speaketh. What Spirit can that be, that teaches Men to slight the Ordinances of Christ? When God gives his Spirit to any, he causes the Receiver to walk in his Statutes, and keep his Commandments and do them, Ezek. 36. 27. But no sooner does any Man receive the Spirit of the Quakers, but presently he casts a slight upon the outward Word, and Or-

N 2

dinances;

dinances; and calls them the *Shell*, and the *Shadow*,
 and *Carnal*. And if the Light within be in e-
 very Man, then it cannot be the true Spirit of
 God; for it is said that the *World* cannot receive
 the Spirit of God. John 14. 16, 17. *The Spirit*
of Truth (observe that, the *World* may receive the
 Spirit of Errour, or the lying Spirit, but the
 Spirit of Truth) *whom the World cannot receive,*
because it knoweth him not, but ye (Believers) know
him, for he dwelleth in you, and shall be in you.
 You see now, that the Lord Jesus Christ, who
 knew how the Matter stood, did not say that the
 Spirit of God was in every Man, but that he
 dwells in his *People*, not in the *World*; and sure-
 ly the *World* must stand for *some Body*; and be
 they who they will, they have not the *Spirit of*
God; therefore this Doctrine of the Quakers, that
 the Spirit is in every Man, is false; unless the
 Scriptures and Christ himself bear a false Testimo-
 ny concerning these things. And if the Spirit of
 God be in every Man that comes into the *World*,
 then there is *no Man in the Flesh*, every one is
 in the *Spirit*; for they say that the Spirit is in
every Man. And then the Apostle lay under a great
 Mistake, when he said, *Rom. 8. 9. They that are in*
the Flesh cannot please God. By that we learn
 that some Men are in the *Flesh*. *But ye are not*
in the Flesh, but in the Spirit; if so be that the
Spirit of God dwell in you; now, if any Man have
not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Then
 if the Light within be the *Spirit*, it cannot be
 the *Spirit of God*; for the most of Mankind walk
 after the *Flesh*. They that walk after the *Flesh*, may
 have an enlightened Conscience, but not the *Spirit*
of God to dwell in them. If the Light within be
 the Spirit of God, and is in every Man that com-
 eth into the *World*, what can be the meaning
 of that Covenant Promise, *I will put my Spirit with-*

in you? Does God only Promise them something that they have already? What does that Promise stand in the Bible for? I add one thing more, upon this Head; that the Light within, cannot be the Spirit of God; for when the Spirit is come, he convinces of the Sin of *Unbelief*, or of not believing in Jesus Christ at the Right Hand of God; but tho' the Light within reproves for Sin against the Law of Nature; it never reproves for the great Sin of *Unbelief*, which is the Sin against the only Gospel-Remedy; therefore the Light within cannot be the Spirit of God.

VI. OTHERS call the Light within, *A Measure of the Light of Christ*; if they mean a Measure of Light from Christ; then we own the thing: For Light, whether Natural or Supernatural comes from Christ; who, some way or other, lighteth every Man; but if they mean, that every Man has some Measure of the Knowledge of Christ, we deny that, and we call in all the Nations of the Earth, to be Witnesses of this sad Truth: What one Man, of many Millions, has ever shewn his Knowledge of Christ, where the Scriptures have never come?

VII. IF the Light within, is a *Measure of Grace*, then it cannot be the *Author* of Grace. If it be but a *Measure*, then it cannot be *Infinite*; and if it is not *Infinite*, then it is not *God*: Therefore it cannot be the *Spirit of God*, who is *God*, and is *Infinite*. That which is Infinite, is boundless and unmeasurable. And that would be strange Philosophy and Divinity too, to assert, that a *Measure* of Grace is *unmeasurable*. Thus they confound God and his Gifts, and shew that the Light within is imperfect, upon their own Principles; for they say, it is a *Measure*. Unless
you

you will slip out your Necks by *G. Fox's* infallible Philosophy; who saith, that *Perfection of Parts, is Perfection of Degrees.* Great Myst. p. 286, 288.

VIII. IF the Light within, is the same with the *Seed Sown*, in divers Sorts of Ground, as they affirm; then it will follow, that Ministers can sow the Light within: For it is their Business to sow the Seed of the Gospel, in their Ministrations: But if the Seed and the Spirit be the same thing, as they say, then they intimate that it is in the Power of the Minister to convey the Spirit to those they preach to. But the Seed cannot be the same with the Spirit; for it is said that *Satan takes away the Seed sown*; but it is not in the Power of Satan, to take away the Spirit.

IX. IF the Light within be the same with the *Corner Stone, which the foolish Builders rejected, and which is now become the Head-Stone of the Corner*, as they say, then the Light within is the only Foundation upon which Souls must rest for Salvation: For there is but one Foundation. 1 Cor. 3. 11. *Other Foundation can no Man lay, than that which God has laid, which is Jesus Christ.* But if their Light within be the same with Jesus Christ, who is at the Right Hand of God; why were they angry with *G. Keith*, for preaching the necessity of Faith in Jesus Christ, who is in Heaven? Can they be the same when one is a *Person in Heaven*, and the other a *Principle on the Earth*? One of *God's* laying, and the other of the *Quakers* laying? The one God blessed for ever, and the other an Idol that cannot save? Thus they attempt to preach the true Christ out of the Bible, out of the Church, and out of the World.

X. IF

X.
true
dwel
in cr
as w
ven
the
The
fering
" be
" hi
" w
" pe
that
ven,
25.
H. E
and
amir
And
war
Con
mean
with
clear
they
posi
the
fers
the
by
thel
suffe
den
not
tur
fer
ver

X. IF the Light within, be the same with the true Christ; then all the Fulness of the God-head dwells in the Light within; and the Light within created the World, and all things in Heaven, as well as all on Earth; and all Power in Heaven and Earth is given to the Light within; and the Light within is over all, God blessed for ever. The Leaders of the Quakers have spoken very differing about these things. *Smith's Cat.* p. 12. "We believe that Christ within us, doth offer up himself a living Sacrifice to God for us; by which the Wrath and Justice of God is appeased towards us." And they seem to deny that the Blood of Christ, who is now in Heaven, can cleanse from Sin. *I. Pennington, Qu.* p. 25. 1667. *Can outward Blood cleanse the Conscience?* *H. B.* saith, *I assure the Reader that this is untrue, and cannot be less than Forgery.* But I have examin'd the Quotation, and find it to be true. And I take his meaning to be this, Can the outward Blood, of the outward Christ, cleanse the Conscience? Now, by the outward Christ, they mean the Christ that suffered upon the Cross, without the Gates of Jerusalem. Can his Blood cleanse from Sin? And by the outward Blood, they mean what he shed upon the Cross, in opposition to what they call his Spiritual Blood, or the living Sacrifice, which, they say, he now offers up in them. And this seems confirmed by the last Quotation out of *Smith's Catechism*, and by *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead Ser. Apol.* p. 146. In these Words, *But that the outward Person, which suffered, was properly the Son of God, We utterly deny.* And then I am sure that his Blood cannot cleanse from Sin; for it was his divine Nature that gave Value to his Blood and one Offering; for it was the Blood of him that was very God, as well as very Man. *Acts* 20. 28. Another

ther faith, *What Righteousness, Christ performed without me, was not my Justification; neither was I saved by it.* And *S. Fisher* speaks to the same purpose. And by the *Blood of Christ*, they mean the *Light within*; the *Blood of the Spiritual Body of Christ*, which, they say, he brought down from Heaven with him, and which he had before he was born of the *Virgin*; and which *Spiritual Body* is now in every *Quaker*, as really as ever it dwelt in the Man that was the Son of *Mary*, and called *Christ*. And so, according to their Doctrine, the *Salvation of Men* is by no other *Blood* than what is within themselves. And by *Crucifying of Christ*, they don't intend it, of crucifying of *Christ*, who died upon a *Cross of Wood*, at *Jerusalem*; but crucifying *Christ* within, by not obeying the *Light*. *W. Bailey* saith, *That the Apostles did not preach a visible Christ, with Flesh and Bones.* p. 600. And the same Author, p. 24, 25. saith, "That whosoever preacheth, or causeth People to believe, that their Saviour is without, and that the carnal Eye may behold the Glory, which is to be revealed. I say, whoever preaches to People of a Saviour without them; and of a Kingdom without them; I charge all such, in the Name of the most high God, to be horrible Blasphemers; and Ministers and Messengers of the Devil." I think these Expressions will appear so gross to every modest Reader, that I have no need to make any Remarks upon them. *Josiah Cole* saith, *If Faith be exercised upon the Personal Being of Christ, it is exercised upon a Fancy and Imagination.* And it appears to be the Judgment of *G. Fox*, *W. Penn*, and *G. Whitehead*; for those Leaders have set their Names to that Book. Now we ask, Was the *Light* within of the fleshly Seed of *Abraham*, of *David*, and of the *Virgin Mary*; and the same that wrought Miracles;

Miracles; and bore the Sins of Men, in his own Body on the Tree; who was crown'd with Thorns; Nail'd to the Cross at *Jerusalem*; and the same Christ that shall come again in the Glory of his Father, with the holy Angels, to raise the Dead, and to Judge the World, at the last Day? Can these things truly, properly and literally be apply'd to the Light within? If not, then the Light within is not the very Christ of God, that is now at the Right-Hand of God; and if so, why do you call upon Men to believe in another Christ, that they may be justified, sanctified and saved? If the Light within, be in every Man, then it cannot be the true Christ; for he dwells in none but believers. *Eph. 3. 17. That Christ may dwell in your Hearts by Faith.* You cannot shew us, in all the Scriptures, that Christ dwells in *Unbelievers*; and if you find any such thing, in your own Books, that will stand for nothing, if it speaks contrary to the Scriptures: For *R. Barclay* saith, *If any one pretending to the Spirit of God, speaks any thing contrary to the Scriptures, we may conclude, that they are under the Delusion of the Devil.*

XI. IF the Light within be that *heavenly Principle*, as they say, whereby Men are put into a Capacity to receive the Grace of God: Then they have Christ, and the Spirit of God, and a Measure of Grace, and a Principle of divine Light and Life, before they have the Grace of God. O the Jargon of this profound Divinity! But where shall Men stop that leave the Rule of the Holy Scriptures?

XII. IF the Light within, be in every Man, then it can be no better than the *Light of Nature*; it cannot be a Super-natural Light, whereby one
O reasonable

reasonable Creature is distinguished from another. 1 Cor. 11. 14. *The Natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him. neither can he know them, because they are Spiritually discerned.* Therefore the **Light** within, as it is no better than the *Light of Nature*, can no more supply the Place of the *Scriptures*, than the *Moon* can supply the Place of the *Sun*. Nay, the **Light** within, without the *Scriptures*, by reason of the **Fall of Man**, is but like the *Moon* in her *Eclipse*. What else can be the meaning of the *Scriptures*, in calling **Man**, in his Estate of *Nature*, but *Darkness*? And under the **Power of Darkness**. Col. 1. 13.

XIII. IF the **Light** within was not a *perfect Rule* to walk by, before the **Fall**, it cannot be a *perfect Rule* now. Tho' **Man** before the **Fall** was free from sinful Imperfections, yet he was not *absolutely*, a perfect Being; for no mere **Creature** can be so; therefore **Man's Light**, even from the **Beginning**, could not be a *perfect Rule*; Upright **Man** wanted a *Supernatural Revelation*, to direct his **Duty**; and it was by a *Supernatural Revelation*, that **Man** in *Innocence*, was directed how to **Worship** his **Creatour**. Then how should **Man's Light** now be a perfect Rule; when it is very much darkened by the **Fall**. The **Light** within can reveal no more than the *Religion of Nature*. It cannot reveal *Jesus Christ*, and **God's Way of Pardon** and **Salvation**; or any one of the *Doctrines*, peculiar to the **Christian Religion**. What ever they pretend to have learnt from the **Light** within, they had been as blind as the **Heathens**, had it not been for the *Scriptures*.

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Holy Trinity.

PAGE 63. *H. B.* takes into Consideration the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. And quotes some Passages out of *R. Barclay*, to shew that he owned that Doctrine, which was granted him before, as to *R. Barclay* himself. But *W. Penn* denies the Doctrine of the Trinity. As to Christ's being Co-essential and Co-eternal with the Father, his being made Man, his dying for our Sins, his rising again, and ascending into Heaven; He speaks of these things, as *confused Babble, canting and Romance*. Guide Mist. p. 25. and represents them as *Fictions*; and saith, *The Vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction being dependent upon the Second Person of the imagined Trinity of Persons*. Sandy Found. p. 16.

I took Notice of this in the REVIEW; and that *W. Penn* does justify *G. Whitehead* in saying, *That he could not understand how Paul, Peter and John could be three Persons, and one Apostle*. *W. Penn* saith, *That it was a most apt Comparison, to detect their Doctrine of the Trinity*. But to answer this supposed apt Expression. The Scriptures every where speak of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, as *divine Persons* in the God-Head, ascribing *Personal Properties* to each of them: As having *Understanding and Will*, and ascribing *Creation* to each of them; and particularly *Redemption* to Jesus Christ, and *Application* of that Redemption to the Holy Spirit. Moreover the Scriptures speak of Jesus Christ, as a *Surety and Mediator*; and as a *Judge*,
O 2
Lord

Lord and *Law-giver*; and of Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God, and each of them, as the *Author of Grace* and Holiness. All which are Characters of a *Person*, and not of a *Principle*; as *W. Penn*, would have Jesus Christ to be, and nothing more. Therefore, for *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* to compare *God* with *Men*, and *Men* with *God*, is foolish and *carnal*; for the Person of *Peter* might Exist without the Person of *John*; and the Person of *James* might Exist without the Person of *Peter*; but it is not so of the Persons in the Godhead; who are all of the *same divine Essence*. The divine Nature, is the *same individual* Nature in every one of them; or else each of these divine Persons could not be properly *God*. But it is not so with *Men*; for so many *Persons*, as there are, so many distinct *Beings*; for every human Person has his own distinct Being. Thus you see that the Divinity of the Light within, which they call their *Gospel*, is directly contrary to the Holy Scriptures. What need have we then to try the Spirits, by the standard of the Holy Scriptures; for thereby we may see that what may be *highly approved by Men*, may be *abomination to the Lord*.

SOME of them have been so weak and Ignorant as to say, that the Doctrine of the Trinity was learnt from the Pope and the Mass-Book. *Great Myst.* p. 346. "The Scriptures does not tell People of a Trinity, nor three Persons, but the Common Prayer-Mass-Book speaks of three Persons, brought in by thy Father the Pope." Again, *Popish Inqui.* p. 53. "And Trinity of Persons in the divine Essence, where learnt you this Article; from the Pope, and from the Mass-Book?" p. 54. This is damnable Doctrine, to distinguish Christ from the Father. How prove you that the Father and the Holy Ghost are distinct from Christ?" We answer, that

that the very Term *Father* necessarily supposes the *Son*; and the Term *Son* supposes the *Father*: For tho' any one might by a *Man* without a *Son*, yet he cannot be a *Father*.

IF you will not allow of a Distinction of Persons in the Godhead, you will, of necessity, be forc'd to run into many *Absurdities*, viz. Then it was God the *Father* that took upon him our Nature; and then God did not give his own *Son*, as the Scriptures affirm, but God the *Father* gave himself; and then, who was the *Father* that the Suffering Person spake unto, when he said, *Father, if it be possible, let this Cup pass from me*. And what will you do with that Expression, *I came not to do my own Will, but the Will of him that sent me*? But *G. Fox* has asserted that it was the *Father* that took upon him our Nature. *Gr. Myst. p. 246*. When one asserted, that God the *Father* never took upon him the human Nature; *G. Fox* answers him in these Words, "Contrary to the Scriptures, who saith God was in Christ, reconciling the World to himself. And art ignorant of the great Mystery, God manifest in the *Flesh*, and his Name is called the Everlasting *Father*." But to whom could he speak if it was the *Father* that said, *a Body hast thou prepared me*; and *lo! I come to do thy Will, O God*? And who was it that spoke from Heaven, when a Voice said, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*? But there would be no End of these *Absurdities*, if they admit of this Unscriptural Doctrine.

THEY have also asserted that Christ and his Spirit are the same, and not distinct. In these Words, "Here is Confusion and impossibility to Man's Wisdom, that Christ should be all one with the Spirit, that Christ should send the Spirit in his Name, and also be himself the Spirit
" whom

“ whom he sends (this is an hard Saying who can bear
“ it) and yet this Confusion to Man is God’s Wisdom.”

1. Penn. 2. p. 23. And Pop. Inq. p. 54. Christ is not divided, for a Person without a Spirit or distinct from the Spirit, is not Christ. Here he makes the Spirit the Soul of Christ. And if they allow not that the Spirit is distinct from the Father : What will they do with such Texts of Scripture, I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter. There are three Persons mention’d, a Person praying, I will pray : And the Person prayed unto, and that is the Father ; I will pray the Father : and the Person prayed for ; The Spirit of God, the Comforter ; who is the Gift of the Father ; He shall give you another Comforter. There are three that bear Witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are One, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And in many other Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testament, we have this Doctrine.

IF the Spirit be not distinct from the Son, how does Jesus Christ say, *If I go away, I will send him unto you.* He does not say, in that Place, *I will come,* but *I will send.* And every Body knows that coming and sending, are two differing things, and necessarily suppose distinction of Persons ; therefore the Father is said *to send,* and the Son is said *to come ;* and again, the Son is said *to send,* and the Spirit is said *to come.*

CHAP.

C H A P. V.

Of Jesus Christ.

PAGE 70. H. B. charges the REVIEW with a most unjust Representation of G. Fox in saying these Words, as applying them to himself; *I am the same Door that Ever was, the same Christ Yesterday, to Day and for Ever.* I see no Injustice in the Charge: For G. Fox, *Sev. Pap. for spreading the Truth*, p. 47. speaks of Christ in the third Person, in two Expressions, *Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life; he is the Door that all must pass through, and he is the Porter that Opens it.* (He does not go on to say, and *he is the Door*, which would have left no Room for any one to question his Meaning; but he changes from the third to the first Person, and saith,) *I am the same Door that ever was, the same Christ Yesterday, to Day and for Ever.* There is no Scripture that hath all these Words put together, whereby it might be pretended that Jesus Christ ever spoke those Words. There is little Reason to think that I have wrested his Words: For you shall hear the Occasion of my putting this meaning upon them; for, in the first Place, his Friends have said, *That the Term Christ belong'd to every Member of the Body, as well as to Christ the Head.* I. Penning. Qu. p. 26. 1667. *Doth not the Name (Christ) belong to the whole Body, and to every Member of the Body, as well as to the Head; And G. Fox himself saith, That he was before all Languages were.* Introd. to his Battledore. *And who was prophesy'd of, but now is fullfilled.* Tit. p. of News coming out of the North. We know that Jesus Christ

Christ was prophesy'd of, and now is fullfilled; but where do we read, in the Scriptures any prophecy of *G. Fox*? Or what is fullfilled in him? Is not this applying to himself, what belongs alone to Jesus Christ? But if I were to say where in *G. Fox* was prophesy'd of, and Now is fullfilled; I can think of nothing that suits him better than those Words, *Mar. 13. 21, 22, 23. If any Man shall say to you, lo here is Christ, or lo he is there, believe him not: For false Christs, and false Prophets shall arise, and shall shew Signs and Wonders, to seduce, if it were possible even the Elect; but take ye heed, behold I have told you all things.* Besides, *G. Fox* saith, *Great Myst. p. 12. You Ministers that say that Christ's Body is out of Sight, are not Saints, neither are you of his Church, which is his Body.* And *p. 207. he saith, That God's Christ is not distinct from his Saints, nor his Bodies, for he is within them; nor distinct from their Spirits; for their Spirits witness him.* This is very strange Doctrine indeed, that God's *Eternal Son*, should not be distinct from God's *adopted Sons*; that the Redeemer should not be distinct from the Redeemed; and that the Author and Finisher of Faith, should not be distinct from every Believer: And that the Fountain should not be distinct from the Cistern; or the Head from the Members. Surely the Head is not the Feet, or the Feet the Head. Thus the Quakers Gospel is a mere Heap of Confusion.

PAGE 72. *H. B.* Excepts against this Quotation, *They say that what Christ did, was but a Type of the Light within them; Christ without was but a Shadow, and we are the Substance.* *H. B.* tells his Reader, that he denies the Matter. Yet it stands plain, to be read of any Man, in *Gordon's Testimony to the true Saviour, p. 36, 37.* where that Man, tho' a Quaker, Charges that Errour upon his

his Brethren. But *H. B.* it seems, is ignorant of the Matter; and supposes that will serve for an Answer. I quoted, *Ser. Apol. p. 146.* wherein their Leaders affirm, *That Christ's Body was no more than a Cloak, or a Vail, like the Bodies, in which the Angels have appeared in former Times,* and threw them off again; which *H. B.* also denies; but there it may be seen, as a Witness against him and them. But it was too plain a Proof for him; and therefore he endeavours to confute it by quoting a Passage out of *Jos Wyeth*, which is no Proof at all that the other Quakers had never said such Words; but rather proves that the Spirits of the Quakers contradict each other.

AND now I will add a little more of their Gospel. *We cannot call the bodily Garment Christ,* *Sauls Err. p. 14.* Yet they call the Light within by the Name of *Christ*; and they say that the Term *Christ*, belongs to every one of *themselves*. And yet they cannot give the Name *Christ* to the human *Body and Soul of Christ*. The Word *Christ* signifieth *anointed*; and it was not the *Godhead*, but the *Manhood* of *Christ* that was anointed; so that the Term *Christ*, belong'd to his *Human Nature*, consisting of *Soul and Body*. God anointed him *with the Oyl of Gladness*, or the rich Endowments of the Spirit, *without Measure*. Yet these Men say, that the Term *Christ* belongs to every *Member of the Body*. What an unaccountable thing is this! that it should belong to their human *Soul and Body*, but not to *Christ's*. How can their Conscience take it to *themselves*, that deny it to the Son of *David* and of *Mary*? *I Pennington, Qu. p. 33.* "This we certainly know, "and can never call the bodily Garment *Christ*, "but that which appeared, and dwelt in the "Body." Now what would any one think he means, by *that which dwelt in the Body*? Some

may think he meant the *human Soul* of Jesus Christ; but that is not what he intended.

HERE it may be needful to open to you, one of the *Mysteries of Quakerism*, gathered from their own approved Writings; and a *Mystery of Iniquity* it is. They hold that Christ had *two Bodies*; one from the *Earth*, the other from *Heaven*: One *carnal*, consisting of *Flesh, Blood and Bones*; the other a *Spiritual Body*, having no natural Relation to *Abraham, David, or Mary*: The one appear'd here upon *Earth* for a little space, the other was from *Everlasting*. They hold that the *Spiritual Body*, which he brought from *Heaven* with him, he also took with him again to *Heaven*; but the *Body* which he took from the *Earth*, he left behind him in the *Earth*. That the *Spiritual Body* is now in *Heaven*, but the *Body of Flesh and Bones* is not there. And that it was by the *Blood* of the *Spiritual Body* of *Christ* that *Men* were redeemed and saved; which *Spiritual Body* of *Christ* is in every *Member* of the *Body*. And that this *Spiritual Body*, does now offer up *Spiritual Blood* in the *Quakers*, for appeasing the *Wrath of God*. These things may serve as a *Key* to unfold some other of their *Mysterious Expressions*. And now I shall go on with their *Gospel*.

SOME of them have asserted, that the *Image* of *Christ*, in them, is the very same *Christ*, that suffered without the *Gates of Jerusalem*. Qu. to Pro. p. 22. "Is not *Christ* form'd in me, if I be
" ingrafted into, and grow up in it, am not I
" ingrafted into *Christ*? And do not I grow up
" into him; and is not this the same *Christ* that
" took upon him the *Body of Flesh*, and offered
" it without the *Gates of Jerusalem*." This serves to explain, what they mean, when they say,
" They expect to be saved by that *Christ*, that
" suffer'd without the *Gates of Jerusalem*." G.
Whitehead's

Whitehead's Light and Life of Christ within, p. 38. They call Christ that suffer'd in the Flesh the Type, and Christ within the Antitype. And say, That they see no need of directing Men to the Type (Christ) from the Antitype (the Light within) neither to the outward Temple; nor yet to Jerusalem, neither to Jesus Christ or to his Blood, &c. p. 40. And where doth the Scripture say, that the Blood of Christ was shed there for Justification? And that Men must be directed to Jerusalem to it? p. 39. G Whitehead ask'd Mr. Burnet, "Where he proves that he is justified, by the shedding of the Blood, that was let out, by the Spear, in so many Words? And where, in so many Words, that the Blood, shed without the Gates of Jerusalem, is the means of Salvation? If that be his Justifier and Saviour, where is it? It is not in being; so then his Saviour, it appears, is not to be found; whereas the Blood of Christ, that Justifies, purges the Conscience, cleanseth from all Sin. p. 16. 40. Where is that Blood, is it in being, yea or nay? Or did it sink into the Ground, and Corrupt; how then doth it cleanse, sanctify, justify and save?" I think that all these Questions amount to thus much, That they deny, that Men are justified by that Blood which Christ shed at Jerusalem; and that it was not the Means of Salvation; that the Blood of Christ does not cleanse from Sin, and save the Soul. Or else I cannot understand these blasphemous Questions. Mr. Burnet answered him, That tho' that very Blood of Christ, which he shed upon the Cross, is not now in being, yet the Virtue and Efficacy of it is still in being. But I add, that by the Blood of Christ, we are to understand, the whole Life, Obedience and Death of Jesus Christ, as the Surety for his People; and so the Blood of Christ is understood of all

that made up the Suretiship-Righteousness of Jesus Christ, and then the Blood of Christ is not worthy of all that Contempt, that the Leaders of the Quakers have cast upon it; saying, *Where doth the Scripture say that Men are Justified by that Blood?* I answer, The Scripture says it, *Ephe. 1. 7. We have Redemption thro' his Blood, the Forgiveness of Sins; according to the Riches of his Grace. And 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as Silver and Gold, — but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb, without blemish and without spot. Rom. 5. 9. Being justified by his Blood, we shall be saved from Wrath thro' him. Rev. 5. 9. And hast redeemed us by thy Blood. Col. 1. 20. Having made Peace thro' the Blood of his Cross: And we are made nigh, to God, by the Blood of Christ. Eph. 2. 13. And this is that Blood by which the Church was purchased. Act. 20. 28. And which cleanseth from all Sin. 1 John 1. 7. Now, by their speaking so contemptibly of the precious Blood of Christ, do they not come near to the Sin, mention'd, Heb. 10. 29. Of how much sorer Punishment suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant — an unholy thing? If they attempt to set aside the Blood and Sacrifice of Christ, as being the means of our Redemption; What do they set up in stead of it? *W. Penn* shall answer for them. *Rej. to Mr. Faldo. p. 284. Christ offers himself in his People, in the nature of a Mediatary Sacrifice. Sandy Found. p. 14. 17. Lond. 1684. He labours to shew, "That Jesus Christ never made Satisfaction to the Justice of his Father, for the Sins of his People, neither as God, nor as Man."* There you have the Divinity that the Light within teaches, I will shew these Things at any Time, to any Man, that is willing to be informed of the Truth.*

THEY

THEY add, *Doth not the Name (Christ) belong to the whole Body, and to every Member in the Body, as well as to the Head?* *Is. Penn. Q. p. 27. 1667.* So that by their Doctrine, every Quaker may be called *Christ*, as properly as he that was born of the Virgin, and suffered at *Jerusalem*. *G. Fox* seems to teach, that it is *Christ within*, and not *Christ without*, or *Christ in Heaven*, that is the Saviour of Souls. *Gr. M. p. 254.* "The Devil was in thee, thou say'st, thou art saved by *Christ without* thee, and so hast recorded thy self to be a Reprobate. They are false Ministers that preach *Christ without*. *Sm. Prim. p. 9.* — and *W. Penn.* That the outward Person that suffered was properly the Son of God we utterly deny." *Ser. Apol. p. 146.* How then is God said to give his only begotten Son? And he makes the *Light within* a greater Mystery, than the Incarnation of the Son of God. *Rejoynd. p. 336.* "It is strange, (saith he,) that that (*Christ's Incarnation*) should be reputed most Mysterious, which was the Introduction to the Mystery (*of the Light within*.)" Yet God has called the Incarnation of *Christ* a great Mystery. *1 Tim. 3. 16.* *Great is the Mystery of Godliness; God was manifest in the Flesh.* But they say, that the *Light within* is a greater Mystery: But how they will make it out, remains a Mystery indeed. *E. Bur.* styles *Christ, God-Man*, within us. *Coll. p. 138.* and he hath said, p. 21. "The Doctrine of Salvation, which is only Necessary, is to preach *Christ within*." Others have spoken Contemptibly of *Christ*, calling him the *Carnal Christ*. *Sw. of the L. p. 5.* "Your imagined God, beyond the Stars, and your carnal *Christ*, is utterly deny'd, and testify'd against, by the *Light*. To say that *Christ* is God and Man, in one Person, is a Lie." Observe this Doctrine; he saith that *Christ within*, testifies against *Christ without*, therefore

therefore they cannot be the same: so that you plainly see the Quakers Christ, is not the Christ of God; Here again under the contemptible Term of the *Carnal Christ*, you learn what I hinted before, that they hold, that Christ had a Body of **Flesh and Blood** as the Seed of *Abraham, David*, and of the Virgin, which they call *carnal*, to distinguish it from their Fiction of a spiritual Body, which they say he brought from Heaven, and carried again to Heaven; the earthly Body was but a Veil to what they call the spiritual or heavenly Body, by which it appears, that they hold that the Body of **Flesh**, which he took from the Virgin, was not a Part of his Person, or a Part of that Christ which now lives at the Right Hand of God, to make Intercession for his People; but that that Body was only an House or Tabernacle for the Person to dwell in.

IF this be their Christ, we affirm that it cannot be the Christ that was promised as the Seed of the Woman, *Gen. 3. 15.* For the spiritual Body, which they talk of, that Jesus Christ brought from Heaven, cannot be that Seed of the Woman; but something that could not be our near Kinsman. Some of them have affirmed, that Christ who was born of the Virgin, was not the *Seed of the Woman, promised, Gen. 3. 15.* but that it is intended of the Light within. *W. Penn, Christian-Quaker, p. 97, 98. The Seed of the Promise, is an holy Principle of Light and Life, (that is the Light within) that being received into the Heart, bruisseth the Serpent's Head.*

PAGE 75. *H. B.* comes to that Quotation which he saith is the only true and exact Quotation, in all the REVIEW. Where *Ed. Bur.* saith, " That the Suffering of the People of God (*he means the Quakers*) in this Age, is a greater Suffering, and more unjust than in the Days of Christ, or his Apostles, — What was done to Christ, and his

“ his Apostles, was chiefly done by Law, and in
 “ a great Part by the due Execution of a Law.”
 This is a very strange Assertion, and it is as strange
 that any Man should pretend to Vindicate it; for
 the Quakers Sufferings can't be *greater* than the Suf-
 ferings of Christ and his Apostles, for he and they
 suffered Death, and the Quakers could do no more.
 Besides, if the Quakers suffered without the *due*
 Execution of a Law, so did Jesus Christ. Indeed
 the *Jews* charged him with the Breach of their
 Law, and with Crimes worthy of Death, but
 the Charge was very unjust; for not only did the
 converted Malefactor, which was crucified with him,
 say that *this Man hath done nothing amiss*; but his
 Judge also, several Times over, said in open Court,
 in the Hearing of his Enemies, *I find no Fault in*
him: If he had broken the Laws either of God
 or of *Cæsar*, would he have thus openly justified
 him? And tho' the *Jews* charged him with Blas-
 phemy, yet it appeared to be a false Charge; but
 being resolved to take away his Life, they subbor-
 ned false Witnesses against him. Was that the
due Execution of a Law? Besides it was God him-
 self, that made that Law which the *Jews* pleaded
 against him. And was it think you, the Design of
 God, that the Innocent should be punished by that
 Law? Surely that Law was not executed, in the
 Person of Christ, according to the true Intention of
 the Law-giver, therefore Jesus Christ did not suffer
 by the *due* Execution of a Law.

AND therefore it is as great Folly in *H. B.* to
 pretend to vindicate *Ed. Burroughs* in that Expressi-
 on, as it was false and blasphemous in *Ed. Burroughs*
 to assert it. And what I argued from this false Af-
 fertion was, that by this unwarrantable Expression;
 they make Jesus Christ a *Sinner*, and his Murderers
 to be *blameless*.

AND

AND then they need not to have been called to *Repentance*, for what they did to him, neither could it have been said truly, that *with wicked Hands, they had crucified the Lord of Glory*. Thus they magnify their own Sufferings, and make light of the Sufferings of Jesus Christ and his Apostles; or make theirs more unjust than the Suffering of the *Lamb of God*, who even in his Death, was *without Blemish and without Spot*.

CH A P. VI.

Of Perfection.

H B. is resolved to find Fault with the REVIEW right or wrong, I honestly quoted *R. Barclay's Account of Perfection*. p. 243. "By Perfection, (*saith he*) we mean not that which may not admit of daily Growth, and consequently, mean not as if we were to be pure, holy, and perfect as God in his divine Attributes of Wisdom, Knowledge, and Purity, but only a Perfection proportionable, and answerable to Man's Measure, whereby we are kept from transgressing the Laws of God; even as a little Gold is perfect in it's Kind, as well as a great Mass; and as a little Child hath a perfect Body, as well as a Man, tho' it daily grows more and more." Yet after this he saith, "He will not deny, but there may be a State attained in this Life, in which to do Righteousness may become so natural to the regenerate Soul, that in the Stability of this Condition, they cannot Sin Others (*saith he*) may perhaps speak more certainly of this State, as having arrived to it."

I observed the Inconsistency of *R. Barclay* from the Comparison of his first Account of Perfection, with his after Practice, in employing about twenty Pages, to prove such a Perfection, as will not admit of Degrees, or growth. And for as much as he knew, that some of their chief Leaders, even in his Time, had spoken and written for *absolute* Perfection; and also knew that the most of that People, do hold the same Doctrine. It was not fair in *R. Barclay* to tell his Reader, that by Perfection, we (the Society of the Quakers) intend no more, than that which is perfect in its kind, as a little Gold, or as a little Child, and not as to Degrees. Therefore this was but an Imposition upon his Reader.

I brought five Quotations, to shew that others of their Leaders had contradicted him, and had affirm'd a Perfection absolute. But Page 80. *H. B.* affirms, that my five Quotations out of *G. Fox*, were every one of them false. I will therefore give you *G. Fox*'s very Words out of each of those five Pages; and begin with Page 111. *G. Fox* saith of *Jer. Ives*, "He saith it is an Errour to say, "they [*the Quakers*] are perfect and without Sin; "and another Errour to say, that none can come "to God and Christ, but they that come to Perfection." *G. Fox* answers him, *Whosoever comes to Christ, comes to him that is perfect*. Observe the notable arguing of his Infallibility; that because *Christ* is perfect, to whom they come, therefore those that come to *Christ* are perfect also. He proceeds. *They that pretend coming to God and Christ out of Perfection, they be in the Errour*. These Expressions plainly shew, what *G. Fox* meant; that he intended such a Perfection, as to be without Sin. So he explains it, *They that say that Men must have Sin, while they be upon Earth; and that plead for it, they are not the Friends of Christ*. And Page 231.

Now ye that say they shall not be perfect, and that none shall be without Sin upon Earth; no Perfection in the Life we live in. You see again, that the Perfection he pleads for, is to be without Sin in this Life. He proceeds, *Ye are not worthy the Name of Ministers, for ye are pleading, while Men live upon Earth, they must have a Body of Sin; and so ye keep them in their Wounds and Sores, putrifying and imperfect.* We answer, That to tell Men the Truth of their Condition, is better than to teach Doctrines that tend to Pride and Presumption, and to shut out the Saviour, and the necessity of Application to the Fountain of the Blood of Jesus Christ, by Faith, for Sanctification. A third Proof that I brought to prove that G. Fox held absolute Perfection in this Life was, Page 271. where he saith, *Have you cry'd up your selves to be the Ministers of Christ, all this while, and have not perfect Knowledge, perfect Holiness, perfect Unity?* The little Society of Quakers, in this Town, is but a very untoward Proof of this Assertion; when they contradict each other in their Speaking, and charge each other with the vilest Crimes. They know this to be true. Thus you see what sort of Perfection he held. But, observe his profound Reasoning. *The least Unity is perfect in the Spirit, and the least Knowledge, and the least Holiness in the Spirit.* His meaning seems to be this, That as soon as any one turns to the Light within, he is perfect in Degrees. Thus their Perfection like *Jonah's Gourd*, grows up in a Night: And is as liable to perish in a Night.

I would ask the Quakers, whether they think the Apostle Paul had spiritual Knowledge or no? If he had, and it be true also, that the least Measure of it is perfect; how came he to say, *We know but in Part, and we prophecy in Part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in Part*

Par
sent
art
" c
" a
" M
A
281
very
" S
" i
" L
" a
" fi
take
Clap
" V
" a
" o
Fox
" D
" a
" E
of G
N
H. E
dent
exan
every
Wor
brou
ump
bath
is n
ligio
port
has
mak

Part shall be done away. If *G. Fox* had been present, he would have told the Apostle ; *Paul*, thou art in an Errour ; " Hast thou been all this while crying up thy self, to be a Minister of Christ ; " and art not perfect ? Thou art not worthy the " Name of a Minister.

ANOTHER of my five Quotations, was Page 281. *G. Fox* charges it upon Mr. *Gawdry*, as a very great Crime, because he asserted, " That the " Saints, in this Life, are partly sinful, and failing in their best Works." *G. Fox* answers, " The " Life of Saints is Christ, not Sin at all ; they " are Believers, and the Works of Faith are not " sinful." Once more, Page 101. (which by Mistake was printed 110.) There *G. Fox* blames Mr. *Clapton* and Mr. *Jenkyn*, for saying, " That our " Warfare cannot be expected to be over, as long " as we are in the Body. And the best of Saints " on Earth doe not live free from Sin." *G. Fox* answers them in these Words, " It is the " Devil that preaches that Men shall have Sin, " and be in a Warfare, so long as they be on " Earth." Thus I have given you the very Words of *G. Fox*, in every one of those five Quotations.

Now have I not Reason to say, how little is *H. B.* to be credited, by his Reader, in his confident Assertion ? When he boldly affirm'd, that he had examin'd all these five Quotations, and that they were every one of them false ; and that there was not one Word, in those Pages, to the Purpose for which I had brought them. And thereupon, he saith, with Triumph, Now, what will the REVIEWER say, when he hath, in every one of those Pages, asserted, that which is not true ? And adds, What is that Man's Religion worth, that shall take such Measures to support it ? But having plainly prov'd that *H. B.* has affirm'd falsities by Wholesale ; I leave him to make out, how this can be consistent with Ho-

neſty and Sincerity. I do not ſay that *you make Lies your Refuge*, but it looks like it; I ſhall little regard your poſſitive Affertions, henceforth; neither is it for the Credit of your Society to let ſuch notorious *Untruths* come forth inſtead of an honeſt Answer. I will not deſpiſe an *honeſt Man* for his Weakneſs, but I cannot eſteem a Man that does not regard *his Word*. By this I learn that thou art far from Perfection. And unleſs you take more Care of *Truth*, you will choak ſome of the Friends themſelves; who dare not take this Method to maintain their Principles.

H. B. Objects againſt another Expression, in the REVIEW, that is, That *G. Fox* aſſerted *That he was perfect as God*. This, *H. B.* ſaith, He utterly denies; and accordingly, reckons it among the many falſe Charges, brought againſt their Friends. The Page, where you may find theſe Words, is 282. You ſhall have his very Words, Senſe or Nonſenſe, leſt I ſhould be charged with another fault, for putting it into better *Engliſh*. “ You where
 “ you are ſees him not, nor know him, not as
 “ he is, we do believe you, but the Saints [*I*
 “ *ſuppoſe he means the Quakers*] the true Church,
 “ whom he is the Head of, whom he is in the
 “ miſt, and in whom he is, (and Chriſt told
 “ his Diſciples they had known him and) they
 “ knew the Son, and had the Son, and they had
 “ the Father alſo, and he that had not, had not
 “ Life, and they had handled and ſeen, and Hope
 “ in its ſelf is pure, and that is it which puri-
 “ fies, and makes him pure, as God is pure;
 “ and Hope now is pure in its ſelf, a diſtinct
 “ Change, and that is to make Men pure as God
 “ is pure.” Now to diſcern his meaning, ob-
 ſerve, that Mr *Gawdry* had ſaid, “ Surely they
 “ [*the Quakers*] cannot be perfect here, or here-
 “ after in *Equallity* with God, but only in *quallity*;
 “ that

“ that is, not in Degrees, but in Kind.” *G. Fox* answers him, “ Jesus Christ makes no difference in his Words ; but saith, Be ye perfect, even as your heavenly Father is, and be ye merciful as he is.” And he affirms that they are arrived at it, “ And as he is, so are we ; and that which is perfect and merciful, as he is perfect and merciful, is in Equallity with the same, which is of God and from him.” Again, Page 27. You have more to the same purpose [I know not which is to be admired most, the good Sense or the Divinity.] “ It is the Devil that speaks in Man, that speaks for Sin, while Men are upon Earth, and speaks ; for the Devil holds up him who makes Men not perfect ; which Truth makes Men free again from the Devil, and speaks in Man, and saith be perfect.”

AND when Mr. *Duke* distinguish’d between Perfection of Degrees and Perfection of Parts ; *G. Fox* answers him ; “ Perfection of Parts is Perfection of Degrees ; for where there is a Part, there is a Degree ; so that in this, thou meddlest with things that are too heavy for thee.” p. 286. One would wonder that such a poor, nonsensical Man should have so many Admirers. This looks as if Ignorance was the Mother of their Devotion. His Argument, such as it is, lies plainly thus ; That the House is finished, as soon as the Foundation is laid ; and a little Child is a Man ; and a Man grown, is a little Child. Again, he saith, “ Where Perfection is in Parts, there’s Degrees ; he that speaks of Perfection of Parts and not of Degrees, he does not understand what he speaks of ; for Perfection of Parts is Perfection of Degrees. p. 288.

SURE no *Tom of Be——m* could have spoken more perfect Nonsense than this inspired Writer. And thus you see that *R. Barclay* and *G. Fox* could

could not both speak by the Spirit of God; for the Spirit of God never contradicted himself: yet they might speak by the same Spirit too. This is the Man that *H. B.* admires; one would wonder whether it is for his Philosophy, or Divinity, or strong Reasoning, his Consistency, or Method, Honesty, or Humility, it is hard to say, but it seems it was for something. For my Part, I am amazed to think how any one of tollerable Sense, should read any of the Books of *G. Fox*, and not be sick of his Inconsistence and Nonsense; nor is that the worst of him: His Pride and Hypocrisy are more abominable. Witness his pretending to understand all Languages by Inspiration. *H. B.* did not think good to take Notice of what I said, p. 33. against their Doctrine of *absolute Perfection* in this Life. From those Words of the Apostle *Paul*, *Phil.* 3. 12. *Not as tho' I were already perfect. but I follow after.* Yet he saith, *ver.* 15. *As many of us as be perfect.* Now, you cannot suppose that the Apostle contradicted himself: He never used to do so; never Man spake with more Consistency and strength of Argument than he; his Writings were not *Yea* and *Nay*; saying and unsaying: But he teaches you to distinguish about the Word *Perfection*; thus, *Not as tho' I were already perfect* (absolutely. but I aim at it) and in the other Verse, as many as be *perfect* (that is further advanc'd in Knowledge, Grace, Experience and Holiness,) as I shew'd you that the same *Greek* Word signifies; and is so translated, in several other Places, I instanced in two, for Example. *1 Cor.* 14. 20. *In understanding be Men* (*Greek perfect*) *Heb.* 5. 14. *Strong Meat belongeth to them that are of full Age; even those who by reason of use, have their Senses exercised, to discern both good and evil.*

I also shew'd, that many Scriptures brought, by them, to prove their Doctrine of Perfection, do not
at

at all prove *absolute* Perfection, in this Life. And I gave them two Instances of it, if possible I might convince them of their Mistake. *Job* 1. 1. It is said, *Job was a perfect Man*. But that was not intended of *absolute* Perfection, but of *Sincerity*; as it is explained in the very next Words, *That Man was Perfect and Upright*; or *Sincere* with God. Like what Christ said of *Nathanael*, *John* 1. 47. *Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no Guile*. And *Job* was a Man that had obtained a greater Measure of Grace than many others; of whom it is said, *ver. 8. That there was none like him in the Earth*. He was a Patern of Patience; and we may be sure that other Graces bore a Proportion thereto. Yet this very Man was not arrived to *absolute* Perfection; to be free from *all Sin*; or to such a State that he *could not Sin*; which is the Notion of the Quakers; or so as to need no more Grace; or to serve God as well as he should do, and enjoy so much of God and Heaven as he expected to do. *Job* was not arrived to such a Perfection. He tells us so, (which is a more certain Exposition of his Perfection, than the Quakers can give.) *Job* 9. 20, 21. *If I say I am perfect, my own Mouth shall prove me perverse*. How did his own Mouth prove him perverse? *Job* 3. 3. *He cursed the Day in which he was born*. And *chap. 6. 8, 9. He wish'd, in a Passion, that God would cut him off, and slay him*. So that he was not absolutely perfect, in *that very Grace*, wherein he excelled many other good Men. *Job* not only knew the Truth of Grace in his Heart, but was also sensible of some Defects, both in Heart and Life.

THE greatest Perfection in this Life, is to know our Imperfection: For saith the Apostle, *When I am Weak then I am Strong*; because such a Soul takes hold of, rests and depends upon the strength
and

and Grace of Jesus Christ. Those that dream of *absolute* Perfection in this Life, know little of God; the Spirituality of his holy Law, or of their own Hearts. They are in Darkness, therefore they see not their own Defects. Behold the Mischief of not looking into the Glass of the holy Scriptures! They look into themselves, and tho' that is a useful Exercise; yet they ought to take the Light of the written Word, to discover the hidden Evils of the Heart. Self-love is such a deceitful Glass, that, like some flattering Pictures, represents the Person, much fairer than the Life. He that has seen his Face in the Glass of the Scriptures, can't think highly of himself; but the more he sees, the more humble he is: Like *Job*, *Now mine Eyes have seen thee; wherefore I abhor [not admire] my self, and repent in Dust and Ashes.* Yet this repenting Man was perfect, in the true Sense of Scripture; tho' not in the Sense of the Quakers. That Man, that can see no Errour in his Heart or Life, is in gross Darkness; tho' he may pretend to more Light than other Men. I look on this Notion of absolute Perfection in this Life, to be as Mischievous as reigning Sin; for it has a native tendency to nourish Spiritual Pride in the Heart, which is one of the most dangerous Sins in the World; and tends to shut out Christ, his Merits and Righteousness, and teach Men to slight the Scriptures, and Ordinances of Christ; these are the fatal Effects of this unscriptural Doctrine among the Quakers.

THE other Scripture that the Quakers bring to prove their Doctrine of absolute Perfection, is *1 Kings 15. 14. Aza, his Heart was perfect with the Lord, all his Days.* Here you have the Word perfect; and they hugg a single Text of Scripture, that carries in it, any sound of their Opinions. But this Text will no more prove *absolute Perfection*

fection than the former did. *Aſa* was perfect in the ſame Senſe as *Job* was, and both in the common acceptation of the Word, in Scripture; as Sincere with God. But what they bring it for is to prove abſolute Perfection. Now let us ſee whether this Text will prove that *Aſa* was perfect in Knowledge, in Grace and Holineſs. (1.) It is ſaid, that *he removed not the High-Places*; that argued his want of Zeal for God and his Worſhip. (2.) That *he robbed the Temple of God*, of the Gold, that had been dedicated to the Lord, therein he was guilty of the Sin of Sacrilege; which was robbing of God himſelf; (unleſs he could ſay, as the Quakers, that he was *moved of the Lord* to do it.) (3.) He was *Wroth and in a Rage with the Prophet of the Lord*, and caſt him into *Prison*; without the *due Execution* of a Law (and you own, that to be one of the greateſt of Crimes, and made the Prophets Sufferings like ſome of the Quaker's, to be greater than Chriſt's.) (4.) He *oppreſſed ſome of the People*, at the ſame Time. (5.) In his Sickneſs, this perfect Man ſought not to the Lord, but to the *Physicians*. 2 Chr. 16. Now, I aſk you, were theſe things his Sins, or were they not? If not, why does the Holy Ghoſt ſet ſuch a mark upon them? And if they were his Sins, then he was not a perfect Man in the Senſe of the Quakers; and thus they wreſt the Scriptures, and force them to ſpeak, what they never intended. So have we ſeen, that their Doctrines of abſolute Perfection, in this Life, has no Foundation on the holy Scriptures.

I will give you two or three Hints more of this Matter, *Great Myſt.* p. 170. *Perfection is not to be attain'd to, by the Life that ye live, until ye come to the Principle of God in you (the Light within) but the Life that David liv'd in, he ſaw an End of all that Perfection.* So he was paſt the growth of it,

R

when

when he saw it End. This is a most ridiculous Interpretation. When David says, *Psal. 119. 96. I have seen an End of all Perfection*; the meaning is, among all the Creatures, there I see nothing but Imperfection. I do not so much wonder at the egregious Ignorance and Nonsense of *G. Fox*, as I do at the Imprudence of the Society of the Quakers; that they can think such a Man fit to be a Guide in the Matters of their Souls; and believe that he was inspired of God, that could hardly speak common Sense. In *Saul's Errand*, p. 8. he saith, "He that hath the same Spirit that raised up Christ from the dead, is Equal with God." And in his Answer to Mr. *Tilham's* Book, p. 14. when Mr. *Tilham* had said, "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect, that is in Quality or Kind; not in Quantity, or Degree." *G. Fox* answers him; "He that is perfect, as his heavenly Father is perfect, is perfect as he is perfect; if thou, or any have an Ear to hear let him hear; and lay away thy Qualities and Quantities." Now, what can be *G. Fox's* meaning, if not to assert, that they are perfect, as God is, even in *Degree* and *Quantity*. As he expresses it in another Place, referred to before; *perfect in Knowledge, perfect in Holiness*. If these things were true, then the Quakers have no need of Prayer: For when Men are got to Heaven, and are there perfect in Knowledge, Grace and Holiness, they will have no need of Prayer; and if this Doctrine of absolute Perfection in this Life were true, then they have no need of the *Intercession of Christ*; for Jesus Christ lives in Heaven, to make Intercession for the Transgressors, but if Men were perfect, then they are not Transgressors; and then they have no need that Jesus Christ should make Intercession for them. And then they have no need of Gospel-Ordinances:

For

For Ordinances are appointed *for the Edifying of the Body of Christ, till they come to a perfect Man.* And by this absurd Notion of *Equality* with God; the Quakers pretend to such a State, as is *more than Heaven it's self*; for tho' the People of God, when there, shall be perfect, according to their Measure; they shall be like Jesus Christ, Holy and Merciful as he is; that is in Quality and Kind, and in a greater Degree than now; yet not in *Equality* with God; for then the *Glorified Creatures* must become *Infinite*; and so be all *Gods*.

BUT would not any reasonable Creature wonder at the Ignorance and Pride of some Men, that can pretend to *absolute Perfection*! Is there nothing but Sincerity in their Hearts? Is there no Evil there? No Vain Thoughts? *David* complain'd of some in his Heart, *I hate Vain Thoughts*; he does not say I have none Have you no wandering Thoughts, in Time of religious Duties? *David* had, we learn it by his Prayer, *Unite my Heart to fear thy Name. Who can say I am clean from mine Iniquitie*? Is there no Byass of Prejudice in the Judgment? No Disorder in the Passions? No Envy? No backwardness to forgive Injuries? No inordinate Self-love? No stubbornness in the Will? No earthliness in the Affections? No unthankfulness in the Heart? Are you so fruitful, and so useful as you should be? Are you so spiritual and heavenly as you ought to be? Is your Faith perfect? And do you love God and Jesus Christ as much as you ought to do; and as much as you desire to do? And have you no Sins to confess, and be sorry for? Have you no more Mercy and Grace to ask for yourselves, by Prayer? Judge of your Doctrine of *Absolute Perfection*; not by your mistaken Leaders, but by comparing yourselves with the written Word of God.

I never liked that Man that pretended to be without fault ; tho' I like not Sin, in any, much less in my self ; but I think he must needs be proud and ignorant, to a very high degree, that can fancy himself to be without Sin. Such a one surely must be upon the same sandy Foundation, with those deluded Souls, *Rev. 3. 17. Thou sayst I am rich, and increased in Goods, and have need of Nothing.* There was their supposed Perfection, in their Fancy and vain Imagination. Behold ! these are the Men, that pretend to know the Hearts of others ; but are great strangers to their own. But Jesus Christ, that knew their State and Hearts, affirm'd, that it was quite the Reverse ; *That they were poor, and wretched, and miserable, and blind and naked ;* and those that thought themselves perfect ; *stood in need of all Things.* Who can say, *I have made my Heart clean ? I am pure from mine Iniquity ?* *Pro. 20. 9. Who can understand his Errours ?* [Even among all them that, from their Hearts, do pray.] *Cleanse thou me from Secret Faults.* *Psal. 19. 12. There is not a just Man upon Earth, that doth Good and Sinneth not.* *Ecc. 7. 20. If we say we have no Sin, we deceive ourselves, and the Truth is not in us.* *1 John 1. 8.* Thus we see that the Saints, both of the Old Testament and of the New, did not look on themselves to have arrived to absolute Perfection.

C H A P. VII.

Of Women's Speaking in the Church.

PAGE 83. *H. B.* saith that those Words,
 1 Cor. 14. 34. *Let your Women keep Silence in
 the Churches: For it is not permitted unto them to
 speak; but they are commanded to be under Obedi-
 ence, as also saith the Law; and if they will learn
 any thing; let them ask their Husbands at Home :
 For it is a shame for Women to speak in the Church.*
 “Do not at all concern Women's Preaching;
 except Preaching and Speaking are the same.” To
 this I answer, That what the Apostle forbad, is
 such a Speaking in the Church, which is de-
 sign'd for the Teaching of others; and you may
 call it Speaking or Prating; it is any thing, where-
 by the Woman sets her self in the Place of a
 Teacher; which is expressly forbidden; for they
 are appointed to stand in the Place and Capacity
 of Learners. And if *she* will learn any thing, let
 her ask her Husband at Home; and not pretend to
 be his Teacher at Church. But *H. B.* saith, “That
 “it is like the Women might take too much
 “upon them; and be busy in asking Questions;
 “and therein to endeavour to usurp Authority
 “over the Men.” To which I answer, That
 this is very *weak* arguing; for would the Wo-
 man's asking of Questions have been usurping *Autho-
 rity* over her Husband? of whose better Judg-
 ment, she asks to be informed? for if any one
 puts a Question to another, for Information, which
 was the case here, such a one does not set up
 himself, or herself, for a *Teacher*; but set them-
 selves

selves in the place of a *Learner* ; and put those that they enquire of in the Place of a *Doctor* or *Teacher* ; such speaking is not to usurp Authority over the Man.

BUT then your Women usurp Authority over the Men, when they set themselves up to be *Teachers* to the Men ; this is directly forbidden, as contrary both to Law and Gospel ; for so the Apostle saith in the Text. Here *H. B.* turns us to the Authority of Mr. *Pool*, in his Exposition upon, 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. who saith, “*Tho’ the Woman be forbidden to teach, [there you see, that Mr. Pool owns that Women are forbidden to teach, in the Church] and commanded to be in Silence,*” [by that Expression, we see again, that she must not speak, upon any Account, no not so much as to ask a Question in the Church ; for if she must *keep Silence*, then be sure she must not teach in the Church,] “*yet that Text must be intended of Ordinary Women ; and Ordinary Cases ; not of such as prophecy’d from an Extraordinary impulse of the Spirit. We read of Prophetesses both under the Old and New Testament ; such as Huldah in Josiah’s Time ; and Anna, Luke 2. 36. And we read that Philip had four Daughters that prophecy’d. Acts 21. 9.* Now, pray observe, from this pretended Authority, *H. B.* would perswade his Reader that Mr. *Pool* was for Women’s speaking in the Church. But Mr. *Pool* is so far from their Opinion, that he is directly against their Practice. He expressly saith “*That Women are forbidden to speak in the Church, unless God should raise up such as he did, now and then, of Old, who were immediately inspired, upon some Extraordinary Occasions.*” Let any one consult Mr. *Pool*, and make their own Remarks ; and I am sure they will see that *H. B.* has been guilty of Weakness, or something worse,
in

in quoting that Place of Mr. *Pool's* Annotations, in their Favour; for unless they can prove that their Women are divinely inspired, as the Prophetesses were, and are *Extraordinary* Prophetesses, which are Mr. *Pool's* Words, then what *H. B.* has quoted, is directly against their Practice. See what poor shifts they are driven to! And as to *H. B's* Criticism upon the Word *λαλειν* to *Speak*, pretending to shew that it is used commonly, in a bad Sense; that is, to insinuate, that tho' a Woman might not speak in the Church for prating Sake; or out of Pride, yet she might do it from a good design. To this I answer, That your Criticism is not worth one Straw; nay I affirm that it is false and groundless; for I will oblige my self to demonstrate, to any one that shall desire it, that that very *Greek Verb* is used in a good Sense, above two hundred Times, within the compass of the New Testament. So much for that Trifle.

WITH the same Assurance *H. B.* quotes the famous Mr. *John Locke*, as speaking in their Favour. Whereas he speaks directly against their Practice of Women's speaking in the Church; unless there should arise an *Extraordinary* Prophetess; one immediately inspired of God: For he saith "That the Woman ought not to set up her self for Doctor or Teacher; or usurp Authority over the Man, that is forbidden: And he adds, "That their Ordinary Women were not allowed so much as to ask a Question in the Church: "Or to enter into any Conference; the Woman, without an *Extraordinary* Call, was to keep Silence."

Now what did *H. B.* quote Mr. *Pool* and Mr. *Locke* for? Can any Body make it consistent with Honesty? Did he think that few of his Readers would have Mr. *Pool* and Mr. *Lock* to consult?
and

and then he might pass undetected. But I could not let such an open Disparagement, of those great and learned Men, pass without Notice, and testimony of my Abhorrence of such *abuse* of their *Name* and *Works*; who would have scorn'd to be thought favourers, of that unscriptural Practice, of Women's speaking in the Church. Here is their Delusion, they take their own strong Fancies and Imaginations, to be Extraordinary Impulses of the Spirit of God; and Inspiration from Heaven; tho' it be to divulge never so much Nonsense.

BUT *H. B.* saith, That that Prohibition, *Let your Women keep Silence in the Churches*; cannot be supposed to contradict the Prophet *Joel*, in these Words, *I will pour out my Spirit upon all Flesh, and your Sons and your Daughters shall Prophecy.* To this I answer, That the Spirit of God, in the Apostles, did never contradict the Spirit of the Prophets. The Apostle *Paul* did not contradict the Prophet *Joel*: For the Prophet *Joel* did not intend it of Ordinary Preaching in the Church; but of Extraordinary Gifts of Prophecy; and immediate Inspiration of the Spirit of God Which Prophecy was actually fulfill'd in the Days of the Apostles: Therefore it is said that they spake *with Tongues, the wonderful Works of God.* And could you find out such among you; these are not forbidden to speak. But where are they? Can the Quakers produce such a one? Can their Women foretell things to come? Can they speak with Tongues? (with one, we know, some of them can fast enough.) Has God ever given them any such Marks of divine Favour, as those of Old had? How can you prove, to us, your Commission from the Lord; and that you are immediately inspired? for we do not believe you; but look on you, with pity, as poor deluded Souls.

Produce

Produce your Commission, and Credentials from Heaven; that we may believe that the King of Heaven hath sent you: Or else I cannot see how you can clear your selves of acting contrary to the Charge of the Apostle; unless you can say that your Assemblies, wherein your Women speak are *no Churches*. Which is much easier to prove, than to make the Scriptures favour your Women's speaking: For a *Church is a Congregation of faithful Men, met together for the Worship of God* [perhaps you will say so far your Assemblies, match to the Definition; but what will you do with the rest,] *where the Word of God is purely preached, and the Ordinances of Christ are faithfully Administered*. For you shut out the Ordinances of Christ from your Assemblies; therefore they are no Gospel-Churches. But why do these Men handle the Word of God deceitfully? And apply those Scriptures to every Woman that has Ignorance and Confidence enough to pretend to be a Teacher of others?

BUT now I will give you *G. Fox's Interpretation* of those Words, *Let her ask her Husband at Home*. And you must not give your selves Liberty to question the Interpretation, since it comes from one that tells you he is Infallible; and therefore cannot Err. "The Woman, the
 "Apostle speaks of, that must learn in Silence,
 "and be in Subjection and ask her Husband, is
 "in the State of *Eve*, who must not teach but learn
 "in Silence, as also saith the Law. Now the
 "Woman here, hath an Husband to ask at Home,
 "and not usurp Authority over the Man; but
 "Christ, in the Male, as in the Female, who
 "redeems, from under the Law, and makes free
 "from the Law, the Man may speak, Christ in
 "the Male or Female who are in the Spirit of
 "God, are not under the Law, but the Whore
 S " who

“ who drinks the Blood of the Saints, is gone,
 “ from her Husband from under the Law, to ask
 “ the Whore-Master that doth drink the Blood of
 “ the Saints, which Christ the Seed judgeth up-
 “ on to whom he gives Judgment.” *Great Myst.*
p. 286. Thus they wrest the Scriptures, and con-
 tent themselves with any manner of Nonsense,
 rather than suffer the Scriptures to be their Rule.

Sol. Eccles Letter to *John Story*, dated the first
 Day of the first Month, 1677. printed by *Tho.*
Crispe, in his *Babel's Building. First Part. Reprint-*
ed at London. 1682. saith, That Women's speaking
in the Church is a great and good Ordinance of Je-
sus Christ which he set up in the Church. It is
 strange that none of them all can shew us any
 Word of it in all the New Testament; nay, it
 is so far from being an Ordinance of Christ, that
 he has, by his Apostle, utterly forbidden it. And
 tho' this false Assertion may pass for a truth with
 some who, on the one Hand, suppose their own
 Writers to be divinely inspired; and on the o-
 ther, seldom search the Scriptures, because they
 are taught, that they are not divine but human:
 Yet it can never be believed by any that search
 the Scriptures, and take them for their Rule of
Faith and Wership.

C H A P. VIII.

Of Silent Meetings.

H. B. disposed to cavil, inferrs, because I spake
 against their Silent Meetings, that I must
 be averse to Silence. If he means to the Ne-
 cessary Duty of Meditation, he does but trifle;
 for

for that was not the thing in debate between us. I like that Duty in its proper Time and Place. But I cannot approve of Silence in the Congregation; that's not a proper Place for Meditation; the Closet is more suitable, or when any one is alone. But whatsoever is pleaded, by them, for their Silent Meetings, as being an *Ordinance of God*; I look upon them as accidental: Namely, because they pretend to speak, only when the Spirit moves them; so that when the Imagination is not strong enough, then there is a Silent Meeting.

BUT if this be the most Spiritual Part of their Worship, as some of them have said, then that's the *most* Spiritual, wherein the Spirit *least* moves them: And then also the Meetings, in many smaller Country Places, are more Spiritual than in the City; for they have not so many Silent Meetings as these have in the Country. But to say the Truth, the more frequent Silent Meetings in the Country, is really from want of a greater Number of Speakers; for as the Number of Speakers increase, so they have fewer Silent Meetings: Quakers, in this Town have not so many Silent Meetings as they had before *T. Coe* set up for a Speaker. But has *T. Coe* by his frequent prating, interrupted the most Spiritual part of your Worship? Tho', sometimes, it seems, he is so full of the Spirit, that he is forc'd to sit down, and cannot speak a Word; having a good Conception, but a bad Utterance. I never read of a Prophet, before him, that was so full of the Spirit, that he could not speak a Word more. I thought the Spirit was to give a Man Utterance, and not to make him Silent. So we read, *Acts 2. 4. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other Tongues, as the Spirit gave them Utterance.* But here's a Man, tells you, that he is ready to burst with the Spirit, and so powerfully

impress'd that he cannot speak a Word. And after all, are they so blind, as not to see this to be a Delusion? There were two Texts of Scripture which *R. Barclay* brought to prove Silent Meetings. *Job* 2. 13. *So they sat down with him, upon the Ground seven Days, and seven Nights, and none spake a Word unto him: For they saw that his Grief was very great.* Here, saith he, was a long Silent Meeting. And so it was indeed; but would not any Man wonder that *R. Barclay* should bring this Example to prove their Silent Meetings to be an Ordinance of God! For *Job's* Friends did not come thither with any View to *Worship God*, but to pay *Respect* to, and mourn with and comfort him. *Ver. 11. They had made an Agreement, both to mourn with him and to comfort him.* This is nothing at all to their purpose, but an accidental thing; for in that they spake never a Word, was not, that they might be found in any Part of *divine Worship*, but they kept Silence, because they saw his Grief was very great.

ANOTHER Text that *R. Barclay* brought to prove Silent Meetings to be an Ordinance of God, was *Ezek. 20. 1. And it came to pass in the seventh Year, in the fifth Month, the tenth Day of the Month, that certain of the Elders of Israel came to enquire of the Lord, and sate before me.* But let it be observed that these Men were only the Elders of their Congregation in *Chaldea*; we read nothing of the rest of the People, no not one in all the Country that join'd with these Elders; and can any one reasonably suppose that all their Religion, nay that the most Spiritual Part of it, as you call it, should be among the *Elders*, or *Nobles*? It never was so before or after; it is strange it should be so just then. Besides, these Men were not all the Elders, but certain of the Elders; and we may suppose some of the worst of them too; for they were

were *not Sincere* with God, but *set their Hearts upon Idols*, and Idol-Worship; and accordingly, God detested their *Hypocrisy*, and rejected them, as *workers of Iniquity*.

How hard was *R. Barclay* put to it, to prove Silent Meetings, to Establish a pretended Ordinance, set up by *G. Fox*; founding it upon *one doubtful Example*, even of a few Men; and *Hypocrites* too, and such as God rejected. Thus they pretend to found their Doctrines and Worship upon *Scripture*; but to what purpose? where is the Sincerity of it? Since they have often affirmed that the Scriptures are *no Rule of Faith*. If true, why do they pretend to bring their Worship under the Rule of the Scriptures? Where is the Sincerity of it? If I being a Christian, should quote the *Alcoran*, to prove my Doctrine or Worship by, which I believe is *no Rule of Faith*; I think I should be worthily esteem'd a *Fool* among *Christians*; and a *Knave* among the *Mahometans*. Thus they that have said, *That the Scriptures are no Rule of Faith*, will sometimes quote the Scriptures, where they find any *sound* of Words, like their own Opinions; but tho' the Scriptures speak never so plain of any thing, contrary to their Doctrines and Practice, then they tell you that the Scriptures are *no Rule* to the Saints. The Case is plain in the Scriptures commanding the Observation of the Ordinances of Water-Baptism and the Lord's-Supper. And also in the Prohibition of Women's speaking in the Church. We have a large Account of the Travels of the Apostles, and of their Sermons; but we never read of any *one Silent Meeting*, in all the New Testament. Here's an Ordinance they tell you, and the most Spiritual of all among the Quakers; without a *Foundation*, either of *Precept* or *Example*. But you may observe they establish a new Testa-
ment.

ment-Ordinance upon an Old-Testament Complement, or Piece of Civil Respect; and worse than that, upon the hypocritical Appearance of a few of the worst of Men, in all the Body of the Captives of *Israel*. And such as came to enquire about *State-Affairs*; and were *Worshippers* of Idols and not of the *true God*. These are the Men that are brought for *Examples* of Silent Meetings, and Men whom God *rejected*. See what hard shifts they are forc'd to make to fasten up their *Dagon*, which will never stand before the *Ark of God*! And however this human Invention may be admired by you, yet it stands branded with the Mark of being disapprov'd of God, in his Rejecting of those very Men, that you bring as *Examples*, and *Patterns*, of this supposed Ordinance of Silent Meetings; and there's the Stump of your *Dagon* fallen to the Ground, without Head or Hands; and, in some Measure, makes good the Words of your Prophet *G. Fox*, *Papist's Strength*, p. 2. 1658. "We do believe, *says he*, that neither "the *Papists*, *Apostates*, *Protestants*, nor the "Sons of *Adam*, nor *Devils* out of the Truth, "can know either Head or Foot of the *Quakers* "Principles, with all their *Thinkings*." And no wonder; for as they seek to hide their *Notions*, by new invented Expressions; so *those* that receive the Truth in Love, shall be mercifully kept from believing a Lye. These shall not know (so as to approve of) the *Depths* of *Satan*, as they speak. Rev. 2. 24.

C H A P. IX.

Of not praying without the immediate Impulse of the Spirit of God.

IN the REVIEW, I granted under this Head, that the best Christians need the Help of the Spirit of Grace and of Supplication in Prayer, to shew us our Wants, to warm our Affections, and to draw out the Heart to the Exercise of Grace: And I also added, that is the more acceptable and profitable Prayer, wherein the Spirit of Grace most interrests himself. But it does not follow from thence. that it is not our Duty to pray, unless we enjoy the sensible Assistance of the Spirit of God, to carry out the Soul with more Enlargement and Comfort, to that necessary Duty. But when the Soul does not enjoy such Assistance, as it supposed it had at another Time, yet the Duty of Prayer should go on; and we find that the People of God have ever done so. *Psal. 51. 8. Make me to hear Joy and Gladness. Restore to me the Joy of thy Salvation, and uphold me with thy free Spirit.* There you see, that *David* prays for the Spirit, and does not omit Prayer, 'till the Spirit comes. So *Psal. 80. 18. Quicken us, and we will call upon thy Name.*

DAVID did not omit Prayer, 'till Quickening should come without it, but he prays for the needful Mercy; And I also said. that if we should follow the Quakers Notion closely, it would be this; That we must not pray for any needful Mercy, 'till the Mercy is obtained. But *H. B.* did not think Good to say any thing to these Things; but passed

passed them over in Silence. Only he takes it ill, that I said, that few of the Quakers pray in their Families; he says, that he wonders that I did not say *all* the Quakers. I think I said more than I was willing to have said; and should have been glad if I had not just Occasion to have said so much as I did.

It is a rare Thing to hear of a Family of Quakers that keeps up daily reading the Scriptures, and the Duty of Prayer. But I say it again, and *H. B.* cannot justly gain-say it, that such Families are very rare to be found; or so much as ask a Blessing from God, upon the Food they eat, unless it be done within, as they pretend, which is not doing it to the Glory of God, as we are all commanded. And I will add, that some of them who, before they turned to the Quakers, were frequent in the Work of Prayer, have shewn themselves but *indifferent* in that needful Work after they pretended to wait for the Spirit. Does that shew that they have received the *Spirit of Grace and of Supplication*? We ought to acknowledge God by Prayer, and by giving of Thanks, tho' but in few Words, at our common Meals. *1 Tim. 4. 4, 5. For every Creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with Thanks-giving; for it is sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer.* And we have the Example of our Lord Jesus Christ, for so doing. *Mat. 14. 19. and 15. 36. Christ first blessed and gave Thanks, and then he distributed the Bread and the Meat to the Disciples.* And we have the Example, also, of the Apostle Paul. *Acts 27. 35. He took Bread and gave Thanks, in the Presence of them all.* And we are told that he that eateth, should Eat to the Lord, and to the Glory of God. *1 Cor. 10. 31. Whether therefore ye Eat or Drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the Glory of God.* *Rom. 14. 6.* He

He that eateth, eateth to the Lord; for he giveth God Thanks.

N o w, under pretence of waiting for the Spirit of God, to move them to these Duties, I believe they grow into an Indifferency; or are ashamed that it should be known, how seldom they are disposed to these Duties of Prayer and Praise; and thence with the Most, they are wholly omitted, under Pretence of doing them within; tho' as has been observed by some, they hardly give themselves Time to do it any way, before they fall to their Meat, or lye down on their Beds.

C H A P. X.

Of immediate Inspiration, and the Spirit of Prophecy; and of Infallibility.

THAT there has been such a Thing, as Inspiration of God, we own; and that the holy Scriptures were given out thereby. And we also believe that some who pretend to have this Inspiration, are deceived: False Prophets have said, *thus saith the Lord*; when the Lord never sent them. The Quakers have affirmed, that they have this immediate Inspiration of God, as the Prophets and Apostles had; For the Proof of this Assertion, I quoted some of their Leaders. Gr. M. p. 242. Where he saith, *That they are in the same Power, Understanding, Knowledge, and immediate Revelation from Heaven, that the Apostles were in, that understood the Gospel.* And more than that they affirm. Gr. M. p. 39. *The Quakers have a Spirit given them beyond all the Fore-Fathers, and that they can discern*

T

who

who ore Saints, and who are Devils, and who are Apostates, without speaking ever a Word.

If this were true, they have a Spirit beyond the Fore Fathers indeed, for we have several Instances, wherein it appears, that the Apostles had no such Gift, as to know the *Hearts* and *State* of others. Acts 8. 13. *Simon Magus believed and was baptized; that is he made Profession of his Faith, and upon that Profession they baptized him. And tho' Philip wrought Miracles, Casting out many unclean Spirits; Cured many of Palsies; and healed many that were Lame; (and therein, he out did all your pretences) yet, it seems, he came behind your Friends; for he could not discern whether Simon was a Saint or a Devil, or an Apostate. But afterwards, he was found to be in the Gall of Bitterness and Bonds of Iniquity; but was not discover'd at last without speaking ever a Word. And in Acts 9. 26. When Saul came to Jerusalem, he assaied to joyn himself to the Disciples: But they were all affraid of him, and believed not that he was a Disciple.*

THUS you see that none of the Apostles could discern whether he was a *Saint or a Devil, or a Reprobate*, (neither without or with his speaking) 'till *Barnabas* took him and brought him to the Apostles, and related to them his Conversion. Again, 1 Pet. 5. 12. *By Sylvanus, a faithful Brother unto you, as I suppose.* There also you see that the Apostle *Peter* did not pretend to Judge, whether *Sylvanus* was a Saint or no, any further than the Judgment of Charity. And how the Quakers should have this Spirit of discerning, beyond the Apostles, we cannot understand; therefore we suspend our Faith, and remain Unbelievers, in that Matter, 'till we shall see more Reason to credit it.

H. B.

H. B. finds fault with me, that I put in the Word *Quakers*; which was not in *G. Fox's* Words. But what harm was there in it? Seeing it was the very Sense and Meaning of *G. Fox*; which I shall manifest from his own Writings. *Great Myst. p. 2.* Mr. *Eaton* had said, "Altho' there be the same Spirit, in all the Saints that gave forth the Scripture, yet all the Saints have not the same Inspiration of the Spirit, that the Prophets and Apostles had; so as that they should be able to give forth infallible Truths, and immediately discover the pure and clear Will of God, as the Prophets and Apostles did." To which *G. Fox* replies, "In this his Ignorance of the Spirit he hath shew'd, and of the Holy Ghost, and himself in the false Spirit, gone out into the World; for the Spirit of Truth shall lead in to all Truth, and bring to Memory Christ's Words; and doth inspire into them, the things of God; and reveal to every one according to his Measure." *H. B.* endeavours to wipe off this Charge from *G. Fox*, as if he did not intend this of *Quakers*, more than others, but of *all* that understood the Gospel. But this is a Quibble; for tho' every one that has Spiritual Understanding of the Gospel, must be supposed to have a Measure of the Spirit: Yet how can he help his old Father in that Expression, "That every one that understands the Gospel, is in the same Power, Understanding, Knowledge and immediate Revelation from Heaven, that the Apostles were in?" This is utterly false. But *G. Fox* would never own that any one understood the Gospel a-right, or was in the same Power and immediate Inspiration from Heaven, but the *Quakers* only. Page 5. "You that have not that which is infallible, to judge in you, know not the Spirit of Christ, neither can you judge of Persons or Things, that have not the infallible Judgment,

“ nor have not the Spirit of God now, neither
 “ have you the Word of God in your Hearts,
 “ nor Christ which is eternal and infallible, [*now*
 “ *pray Mark*] all which the *Quakers* have; to judge
 “ Persons and Things.”

THUS you see plainly that *G. Fox* intended it
 of the *Quakers*; and you see also what little Reason
H. B. had to cavil at my putting in the word
Quakers. (which I did, not to pervert his Words,
 as he falsely insinuates, but truly to explain them.)
 Thus he makes a Man an Offender for a Word;
 which was much better in, than out.

E. Borroughs in his Epistle to *Great Myft.* saith,
 “ We received often the pouring down of the
 “ Spirit upon us, and the Gift of God’s Holy
 “ eternal Spirit, as in the Days of old; and our
 “ Tongues were loosed, and our Mouths were
 “ opened, and we spake with new Tongues, as
 “ the Lord gave us Utterance, and as his Spirit
 “ lead us; and things unutterable was known and
 “ made manifest.” Great swelling Words indeed!
 does not all this look as if they spake with o-
 ther Tongues, as the Apostles did? But which of
 all the *Quakers* could do so? This looks like *Pride*
 and *Osntation*. And no less than *Lies* spoken in
 the Name of the Lord, as the false Prophets used
 to do. And other *Quakers* have said as much
 of him (for they are never wanting to cry up
 each other). *Test. of Truth concerning E. B.* p. 19.
 “ I declare unto all People, unto whom these
 “ shall come, that he was a Man endowed with
 “ the Almighty Power of God, which lived and
 “ reigned in him; and the Treasury of pure di-
 “ vine, heavenly Wisdom was opened in him.
 “ He was a Man in whom the fullness dwelt of
 “ Grace and Virtue.” p. 24. O horrid Blasphemy!
 Our Bible speaks thus of *Jesus Christ*; but not of
 any mere Creature on Earth or in Heaven. Sure
 the

the *Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge* are alone in Christ. He alone is the *Fountain and Treasury of Grace*. And he alone has Grace to spare to others; and of his *Fulness* all his People receive and *Grace for Grace*.

G. Fox will not allow any to be Ministers of the Spirit, that are not *infallible*. *Great Myst.* p. 82.

“How can ye be Ministers of the Spirit, and not of the Letter, if ye be not infallible? And how can they but delude, who are not infallible? Your Church and your Ministry hath made it's self manifest not to be agreeable to the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, for you say that you are not infallible. Page 89. And thou and you all that speak and write, and not from God immediately and infallibly as the Apostles did, and the Prophets and Christ; but only have gotten the Words, you are all under the Curse.”

BUT it is something strange that they should affirm every Quaker to be infallible; but thus they do. *Great Myst.* p. 212. “Every Man that hath a Measure of the Spirit, in the least Measure, or Degree, it is infallible, and so far may they teach infallibly.” And this infallibility, they say is necessary in order to know the Scriptures. Page 213. “Thou canst not know the Scriptures, but by the same Degree of the Spirit that the Prophets and Apostles had.” Page 224. “You are not like, none of you, to understand the Apostles Words, nor to be Judges of them, but as you do come into the like Measure and Gifts, as they was in. Else you will not be able to judge of their Condition, nor know their Words.” This is strange Divinity indeed, and was never learnt from the Scriptures. What can none understand the Words of Scripture, unless they have the same Measure of Knowledge and Gifts

Gifts of the Spirit as the Apostles had ! this is directly contrary to the Scriptures: For the Apostle *John* saith that some, in the Family of God, are but *little Children*, and yet these *know the Father* ; they know God, so as to put their Trust in him : They know Jesus Christ so as to come to him. But *G. Fox* saith none can know God or his Word, but such as have the *same Measure* of Knowledge as the Apostles had. If this Doctrine were true, it would Exclude many a sincere and honest Christian from the Knowledge of the Scriptures ; who, tho' they know God and choose him ; and know Jesus Christ, believe in, love and obey him ; yet dare not allow themselves to think that they have arrived to the same measure of the Apostles ; and tho' Gospel-Ministers cannot look on themselves to be infallible ; yet they have an *infallible Rule* to go by, in all their Ministrations, which is the holy Scriptures ; and they have the Spirit of God, who is an *infallible Guide* ; yet they do not hold themselves to be infallible ; tho' the Spirit of God is so. *W. Penn* saith, That *Quakers are no further infallible than they follow the Light within*. So that if you leave your chosen Rule, you are fallible as well as we. For our Parts, we had rather speak humbly, and truly, like the Saints of old, *We know but in Part. What I see not teach thou me*.

AND after all the boasting of these perfect and infallible Men, pretending to have the same Degree, or greater than the Apostles ; none so wretchedly pervert and wrest the Scriptures as they do ; and broach such loathsome Nonsense as their inspired Writers. Surely never was such Stuff committed to Paper and Ink. *Great Mystery* speaking of Jesus Christ, he saith, *By whom the World was made before it was made*. Again, p. 238. *By which the World was made, before it was made*. Again, p. 239. *In him by whom the World was made, before it was made*. And in his Answer to Thomas

Tilham's

Tilham's
it
ma
Lon
T
sion
the
spir
not
from
Whi
one
reas
" r
" fi
" a
" b
" t
" o
" F
faith
" v
" J
" e
falli
it v
tist)
libil
A
Job
two
p. 7
" t
" V
" s
" c
Tha
ker.

Tilham's Book. Christ, that made the World before it was made. Letter to O. C. 1658. Christ that made the World before it was made. Pearl found. Lond. 1658. p. 11. and in many other Places.

THUS you see that it was an *admired Expression* with him. And I believe he had Right to the *Original*. O infallible *George!* This same inspired, infallible Man saith, You Papists which do not discern the Soul and it's State to Eternity and from Eternity, ye Err in the Mystery of the Gospel, which gives Liberty to it. Great Myst. p. 338. When one said, That Evil Spirits were both *sinful* and *reasonable*. G. Fox saith, This is a Lye: "For reasonable is not sinful, and unreasonable is sinful; and if the evil Spirits are reasonable, and the good Spirits reasonable, then they are both one. Thou puts no Difference between the Precious and the Vile; thou hast the mark of the blind Guide, and false Prophet in thy Forehead." O most ridiculous! Again, G. Fox saith, "That it was John the highest Prophet that was born of a Woman, that said these Words, John 1. 9. That was the true Light that lighteth every Man that cometh into the World." His Infallibility was quite out in that Assertion; for it was John the Evangelist (and not John the Baptist) that spake those Words. Thus their Infallibility often fails them.

ANOTHER of their approved Writers makes John the Evangelist, and John the Divine, to be two distinct Men. E. Bathurst's Truths Vindication. p. 7. "John the Evangelist calls him the true Light, that lighteth every Man that cometh into the World; the other John, or John the Divine, saith this is he, which was and is and is to come." And W. Penn with his Infallibility, said That Christ was born at Nazareth. Christian Quaker. p. 104. And Tho. Elwood, another of their inspired

inspired Writers, affirms the *same thing*. *Truth's Defence*. p. 167. Contrary to them, the Scriptures tell us plainly, that Christ was born at *Bethlehem*. Now, if we apply to *G. Fox* and his Friends, what he himself has asserted, in the Name of the Lord. *Great Myst*. p. 89. *Such as Speak and Write, and are not Infallible, are all under the Curse*. There he has cursed himself, and *E. Bathurst*. *W. Penn*, *T. Elwood*, and others of his dear Friends. But behold the Impudence and horrid Blasphemy of their Champion; *S. Fisher*, p. 575. "We assert, *saith he*, the Saints and Ministers of Christ, *[that is the Quakers; for they call all others false Ministers]* to be Infallible, no farther than they follow the leading of the Spirit, which is Infallible. And who makes them not only Infallible, but Omniscient as himself is; Omniscient in all things? Absolutely; without Exception; neither are Omnisciciency, or Omnipresency themselves, as to all these things, that are to be known and done by such, so altogether incommunicable to Spiritual Men, as our Accademical Animals imagine they are." I think this is so gross, that it needs no Remarks from me. You plainly see, that they Equal themselves with God. They are *Infallible*; they are *Omniscient* as God is; in *all things*; and *absolutely* so; without any *Exception* (I suppose he means, or without any *Limitation*.) Now they must have a notable Stock of Impudence, that shall pretend to Vindicate such blasphemous Expressions as these. Again, he adds, there are some, who do not more profess themselves to be, than they are indeed, inspired by the Holy Spirit, whose Messages and Ministrations, whether by Voice or Writing, are so immediate from the Mouth of the Lord, that your not receiving, nor submitting to them, doth justify your Predecessors, that rejected and slew those

that

that spake to them in the Name of the Lord. p. 559
 Again, he saith, *There are some, whether they work Miracles, yea or nay; that's nothing to thee, that being divinely inspired, their Doctrine is to be received by you, as from God.* Here he tacitly owns, that they could not, or did not work Miracles, as the Apostles did; and he saith, *that's nothing to thee.*

BUT we Answer, That it is very much to us; for if the Apostles had not confirmed their Doctrines and Mission from God, by Miracles, few of the *Jews* wou'd have believed them. And for as much as you come to us with a new Dispensation; we expect that you should confirm it with Miracles, as the Apostles did; or else we shall take the Liberty to hold fast the Doctrines and Worship, established by the holy Scriptures; which, we are sure, God has set his Seal unto. And hope we shall pity and pray for you, as having unhappily fallen to *another Gospel*, which will expose its Followers, to the Curse of God. *Gal. 1. 8.* But tho' it is probable, that *S. Fisher* might never have heard of it; yet one of his Brethren says, that they have wrought Miracles. *Mod. Quak. p. 13.* "By the mighty Power of God, Miracles have been wrought among them; and miraculous Things has been brought to pass, in a Mystery, which is hid from all Vulturous Eyes living." *Rep. to the Pret. Vind. recommended by G. Fox. Lond. 1658. p. 14.* "Visible Miracles hath been done by the Lord's Power, and the Spirit, since the Days of the Apostles, among us, in the sight of the World."

S. Fisher did not know of any Miracles, wrought by his Friends, visible to the World; if he had, he would have told us of them: But others, it seems, knew of some Miracles, wrought by their Friends; but they own that they were Mistical; but this Friend out-strips them all, and roundly affirms,

affirms that they have wrought Miracles ; and that in the View of the World. We have but his *ipse dixit*, which is but a slender Proof : He does not tell us *what*, or *where*, or by *whom*. The holy Scriptures don't put us off so ; for when they relate the Miracles of our Saviour, or his Apostles ; they tell us plainly, *what* the Miracles were, and *where* they were wrought, and by *whom*, and also who were *Eye-Witnesses* ; and all the *Occasions* and *Circumstances* of the thing ; so that there could be no Cheat. But this Advocate for the Quakers says not a Word, either *what* or *where*, or *when*, or by *whom* ; and therefore we believe Nothing of it.

C H A P. XI.

Of Water Baptism.

H. B. hurries over this Chapter without Answering any thing, to the purpose, of what I had therein laid down, in Opposition to what *R. Barclay* had said, p. 418. *That Water Baptism was not the Baptism of Christ* ; in Answer to which false Assertion I said ;

I. **T**HAT the Apostles were *commanded* to baptize, *Mat. 28. 18, 19, 20.* And that the same Command extends to all after Ministers of the Gospel ; or else there had been no occasion for these Words, *Lo I am with you always even to the End of the World.* If this appointment was to cease with *Jewish Ceremonies*, as some of them have weakly said, why did the Lord Jesus Christ renew his Charge about it, when he was *just* going out of the World ? And if this Gospel-Ordinance was

was not to stand in the Church till the *End* of the World, why did Jesus Christ make a Promise of his Presence with them in observing this Ordinance *to the End* of the World?

II. THAT Baptism with *the Spirit*, could not be intended in the Command of Jesus Christ to his Disciples; For then it would follow, that the Change of the Heart, and putting of the Spirit within any, would lie in the Power of the Minister: But Baptizing with the *Spirit* is intirely the *Lord's Work*. *Ezek. 36. 26. A new Heart will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you.* Hence I observed three things;

1. THAT all Men have not the *Spirit of God* in them by Nature; for God does not, there speak as if Men had the *Spirit already*; but he makes a Promise of his Spirit to some that had it not before.

2. THAT the baptizing with the *Spirit*, or God's putting his Spirit in any, is five Times spoken of as *God's Gift*; and not in the Power of Ministers.

3. THAT where God has baptized any with his *Spirit*, or has put his Spirit within them, the Spirit of God ever inclines that Soul to walk in his Statutes, and carries them by the Way of his Word and Ordinances; whence I conclude that such as slight the Scriptures and the Ordinances of Christ have not obtained this Promise. Here let the Quakers behold their Faces.

III. THAT *Water-Baptism* was what the Apostles practiced in the Churches and Families where they preached the Gospel. And after God had baptized some with the *Holy Ghost*; the Apostles baptized them with *Water* also. *Acts 10. 44. Who can forbid Water that these should not be baptized,*

who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord. ver. 47, 48.

Who shall forbid them? why, if there had been any Quakers among them, they would have taught the Apostle Peter, that *Water-Baptism*, was John's Baptism, and not Christ's; and that the Disciples having been baptized with the Spirit, had now obtain'd the Substance; and had therefore nothing to do with the Shadow. But who best knew the Mind of Christ? I also added from *Acts* 8. 36. That the Eunuch was baptized with Water, after he had been baptized with the Spirit; for it is said that he believed. I also quoted, *Heb.* 10. 22. Let us draw near with a true Heart in full Assurance of Faith, having our Hearts sprinkled from an Evil Conscience [There's the Baptism of the Spirit] and our Bodies washed with pure Water. [There's the Ordinance of Water Baptism.] But these and many other things *H. B.* passed over in Silence. A notable way of Answering indeed. But instead of giving an Answer to these things, *H. B.* tells us how the Papists have corrupted the Ordinance of Baptism; which is very trifling; for I was not pleading for any thing but the pure Ordinance of Jesus Christ.

C H A P. XII.

Of the Lord's-Supper.

I Had taken Notice that *R. Barclay*, p. 453. had said, "That Men are not tyed to the Ceremony of breaking of Bread." If he means it of the Quakers, it is true; they are not tyed, indeed;

deed ; for they will not be bound, with any Precepts of the Gospel. He confesses, " That the *Corinthians* did observe the Lord's-Supper, but, he " faith, they did it only as some Men observed " a Day, that some others did not." And then he attempts to make some believe, " That Jesus " Christ only charged, that as often as they eat " Bread, and drink Wine at their own Tables, they " should remember him, even in eating and " drinking their common Food." To this I answer'd, That when the Lord Jesus instituted his Supper, he gave them a Commandment to eat, and to drink, as well as to remember him in eating and drinking ; now, did ever any Man in Health and in his Senses, need a Command to eat and drink his common Food ? Besides what could be the reason why Men should be charged to examine themselves before they may eat and drink ? And in what Sense do Men shew forth the Death of Christ, at their common Meals ? And how is our common Bread the Body of Christ ? Or how is our common Wine the new Testament in the Blood of Christ ? And how are Men said to discern the Lord's Body in eating at their own Table ? Thus I shew'd the great Absurdities of their unscriptural Assertion. But H. B. did not think good to answer these things : Yet he thinks he has done it in saying never a Word. What ! was he self-condemn'd ; or would his Spirit yield him no assistance, when the nakedness of their Cause was so exposed ? I observed that R. Barclay called the Lord's-Supper a carnal Ordinance. p. 457. and goes on to shew " that eating " Bread and drinking Wine is a natural Act ; " and is for the Service of the Body, but adds " nothing to the Soul." I Answer, as to our common Meals, it is true ; but not as to eating and drinking at the Lord's-Table. Was there no
more

more than a natural Act, in *Israel's* eating the *Passover* ? Sure there was. And *Jesus Christ* is called *our Passover* ; and the *Lord's Supper* is a commemoration of the *Death of Christ* ; this therefore is *our Passover* ; and the *Apostle Paul* calls it so. And true Believers keep this Feast in the Exercise of *Grace*, to their *Spiritual nourishment* and *Growth in Grace* and *Holiness*.

I also shewed how *R. Barclay* goes on trifling, and faith, p. 478. That that Charge "*Do this till I come ;*" is till *Christ is risen in the Heart*." But this fancy also is freighted with Absurdities, for then it will naturally follow, that while Men are in a natural State, they ought to eat the *Lord's-Supper* ; but as soon as *Christ* is risen in the Heart, they must have no longer to do with it. So that according to his *Divinity*, the *Lord's-Supper* was appointed only for *Unbelievers*. What ! are they the fittest Persons to discern the *Lord's Body* ? Can such eat and drink *Worthily* ? And in *Faith and Love*, who have no *Grace* at all in their Hearts ? Are these the *Friends* and *beloved*, that *Jesus Christ* calls to eat and drink ? These are great *Absurdities*, that attend their Principles.

BUT I carry'd *R. Barclay's* Assertion further, as it was borrow'd from another Page, and shew'd that it would naturally follow, from his way of thinking, that as soon as *Christ* is risen in the Heart, Men must leave off eating and drinking their common Food. Moreover this absurdity will follow, that the *Apostles* either did not understand or practice their Duty ; or else *Christ* was not risen in their Hearts, when they did eat the *Lord's-Supper*. But *H. B.* does not think good to answer one Word, to all these Charges ; or to make *Apology* for these Absurdities. It's easy to answer any Book after his Manner. But their Friend *Smith, Prim.* p. 36. faith, *That Baptism and the Lord's-*

Lord's-Supper, were invented by the Pope. By this he betrayes his Ignorance and Fallibility; for if both these were in Use, in the Apostles Time, then the Pope could not invent them; unless he would make his Disciples believe that Christ was the Pope, and his Apostles were his Cardinals. And E. Burroughs saith, that the Lord's Supper was an Institution of the great Whore. Answ. to Mr. S. Eaton's Catech. p. 12. And calls the Observation of it Idolitry, and carnal. False Prin. p. 13. Fr. Howgil, also, calls the Lord's-Supper, The Table of Devils, and the Cup, the Whore's Cup. Pope Inqu. p. 49. And G. Fox calls it a Table of Devils, and a Cup of Devils. News from the North, p. 14. But it is said "That G. Fox call'd it so, as it is abused by wicked Men, who come to that Ordinance to make "atonement for their Sins." This is but a poor shift; for why did G. Fox apply to an Ordinance of Christ, that which belong'd only to the Feast in the Idol-Temple, which was an Ordinance appointed by the Devil, and wherein they had communion with Devils? If Gluttons and Drunkards abuse their Food; that does not make the Food to be naught: And if wicked Men abuse the Ordinance of the Lord's-Supper; their Sin does not alter the Nature and Ends of that holy Ordinance: It is still the Table of the Lord, and not the Table of Devils; and the Cup is the New Testament, in the Blood of Jesus Christ, and not the Cup of Devils. Tho' this Ordinance has been abused by wicked Men, yet their Sin does not nullify the Ordinance; nay, we argue for the Use even from the very Abuse of it; for what is Abuse? but ab Usu.

C H A P. XIII.

The Conclusion.

NOW I shall conclude with a few Remarks. *H. B.* tells you that he has *impartially consider'd the REVIEW*, and finds it an *illnatur'd, malicious Performance*; and done without *Order or due Method*, and that he has been very *unjust in his Quotations*, and has declared to the World, that for their Principles which are not so. I shall consider this Charge distinctly.

I. HE saith, That the REVIEW is an ill natured Piece. I answer as to the ill-nature of it, I leave to the Reader to judge. Have I in all that Book, given such ill-natur'd *Language* to the Quakers, as you have given to me, while you charge me with want of *common Honesty*; with *forging of Lies*, to reproach others; with *injustice and uncharitableness*?

II. That the REVIEW is a malicious Performance. For this I appeal not to Men, but to God the Searcher of Hearts. And I am sure that he knows that *H. B.* in this matter, wants *charity*. And *H. B.* cannot bring one Evidence of it. Thus the unjust Judge measures another Man's Corn by his own Bushel.

III. HE says, That the Author of the REVIEW has been unjust in his Quotations. If I have quoted nothing but the very Words, or Sense of your Friends, where is the Injustice? If the Printer misplac'd

misplac'd a Figure, you deny'd that ever your Friends had written any such Words; where is the honesty of that? If you did not know that those very Words had been often in Controversy before: You are a rare *Champion* for their Cause. If you approve of the Expressions which I have quoted out of your Friends Books, why are you angry? But if you do not approve of them, why do you re-print their Works, where these things stand? Answer that *Dilema*, if you can.

IV. HE adds, *That the REVIEW has declar'd to the World, such things to be their Principles that are not so.* He does not say such things as they do not approve of; but such as are *not so*. I grant and thousands more, that know their Principles, will readily grant, that they hold Doctrines that are *not true*. But I suppose he means that I have declared to the World such things for their Principles, as they *do not hold*; and that may be the Reason why he charges me with *Lies*. To this I answer, *If I have spoken Evil, bear Witness of the Evil.* If I have misprinted a Figure in any Place; that's not worth all your Out-cry of *Injustice and Malice and Uncharitableness, Envy and Lies*. But if I have injured them in *Words or Sense*; shew the Place and I will acknowledge it. But if I have not, it is most *unjust and base* in you to represent me as *Vile* as you can. I have shewn you in *five Instances in one Page* how you have wronged me; and have plainly prov'd your self a *Lier*, by Wholesale.

H. B. takes notice, "That I own'd the Quakers to be peaceable Neighbours, free from open Vices." And so they commonly are. Then I said that they may, in such things, be set as Examples to thousands; (I did not mean to thousands of good Christians, but to thousands of com-

mon Inhabitants of the Towns, where they live.) Hereupon *H. B.* saith, That he supposes, that I mean to set the Quakers as Examples to thousands of *Christians*. But that was his mistake, whether wilful or not I must leave it. I am sure that my Words will bear no such Construction: For I said that *in such things* they might be set for Examples; but what things were they? No Doctrines of the Christian Religion, or any real Holiness, or the Method of Gospel-Worship; but in their *Sobriety and freedom from open Vices*. Moreover *H. B.* might have seen, in the same Place, that I excepted religious Matters; for in the next Line, I added these Words, "But in the great Concerns of our Souls Salvation, or in the Matters of Faith and Gospel-Worship, I must take the Liberty to speak according to the Word of God, which I heartily own to be the sole Rule of my Faith and Worship." These Words stood as fair to be seen and read as those that he took Notice of; why then did he pervert my Words? We cannot take this for honest Dealing.

IN Page 113 *H. B.* affirms, *That the Quakers do not deny any one Article of the Christian Faith.* I Answer, That if he makes the Light within his Standard, he may come off well enough in the Judgment of his Friends; but I shall now bring him and his Doctrines to the Test of the holy Scriptures, and then see if there be any Light in them.

I. HE saith, *That they do not utterly reject a Sabbath.* And how does he make that out? Because they hold it, not holy to the Lord, but only a convenient Season, now and then, to separate themselves from worldly Business; but they don't do this out of any Conscience of keeping it

it as holy Time to the Lord, more than any other Day in the Week : So that this is but an Equivocation : For their Chief Leaders have said that the *Sabbath is done away in Christ* : And this is a riveted Notion among their Disciples ; for which I appeal to the Consciences of such as are honest.

II. HE affirms, That they *do not deny any of the Ordinances of Christ* ; and yet they shut Water Baptism and the Lord's-Supper out of the Church ; which our Lord Jesus Christ appointed to continue to the End of the World. Is it not strange that he could think such an *Untruth* should be swallow'd down by his Reader. To say they *do not deny* these Ordinances ; when they know in their own Consciences, that they *deny* them, both in *Doctrine* and *Practice*. If a Man can assert such a palpable Untruth, where is the Conscience of such a Writer ? All the honest Quakers must own this to be an Untruth, they rather choose to say, " That tho' they were once Ordinances of Christ, " yet they are now to be laid aside, as the *Jewish* " Rites are." But I suppose this Writer to be a-kin to the Knights of the Post, who can say or swear any thing. But will the Society call this a private Man or no ?

III. HE saith, *We do not teach Men to patch up a Righteousness of their own ; but assert that all our Righteousnesses are filthy Raggs, and that the Righteousness that Christians are to be clothed with, is the Righteousness of God by Faith in Jesus Christ.* If this be really the Judgment of H. B. he had better have said, That this is really my Opinion. But why does he speak like R. Barclay in representing this to the World, as the common Opinion of the Society of the Quakers. This is far from Sincerity. Did not this Man know that R.

Barclay, whom he undertakes to vindicate ; was of another Judgment ? And could he be ignorant that *S. Fisher* has written very much against it ? And that the Works of these Men are in great Esteem among them ? These Men have told the World that they are for Justification before God by Works and by the Merit of Works. And *G. Fox* puts the Light within, in the Place of the Righteousness of Faith. *Great Myst.* p. 183. *They that have Christ in them, they having that [Light within] have Righteousness it's self, without imputation.* And *W. Penn* saith with regard to the Doctrine of Justification by the Righteousness which Jesus Christ fulfilled in his own Person, for his People, *this we deny and boldly affirm it, in the Name of the Lord, to be the Doctrine of Devils.* *Ser. Apol.* p. 148. And *G. Whitehead, Light of Life.* p. 30. saith in a sort of Contempt, *Where does the Scriptures say, that Christ's Blood was shed, at Jerusalem for Justification ?* We answer, *Ephe. 1. 7. We have redemption thro' his Blood, the forgiveness of Sins, according to the Riches of his Grace* *Rom. 5. 9. That we are justified by his Blood.* Therefore the Blood of Christ is called the Blood of the new Covenant, or new Testament. *This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood.* *1 Cor. 11. 25.* This is a Memorial of the Blood of Christ shed for the Confirmation of the new Testament. But the Quakers Gospel is, that the Blood of Christ, that cleanseth the Conscience, is not the outward Blood of Christ, which he shed at Jerusalem. *Can outward Blood cleanse the Conscience ? No, the Efficacy of it is within.* *W. Penn, Quaker a new Nick-Name.* p. 147. and *S. Chat,* p. 12. *Christ in us, offers up himself a living Sacrifice to God for us.* The Scriptures say that Jesus Christ offered himself but once, and no more, and that was at Jerusalem, and not within every Quaker ; therefore by the Judgment of *R. Barclay,* those

those Quakers, that hold this Opinion, are under the Delusion of the Devil. But W. Penn makes Christ's offering himself at Jerusalem, the History, and his offering himself in them, the Mystery. *Ans. to J. Faldo. p. 336.* But say they, *Where doth the Scripture speak of Christ's making Satisfaction to the Justice of God for Sin?* I answer, That the Blood of Christ is said to be the Price of our Redemption, *Eph. 1. 7. We have Redemption thro' his Blood. 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as Silver and Gold, — but with the precious Blood of Christ.* Now we ask, To whom was this Price of Redemption paid? Not to Satan; but to the Justice of God. But observe the Deceit and Cheat that is in their Question: If there was no need of the shedding Christ's Blood for the Satisfaction of divine Justice without us; then there can be no need of Christ's offering up himself a Sacrifice within them; which the Quakers say he does now. But thus they shuffle forward and backward; something or nothing, so they may but render the Blood of Christ, shed at Jerusalem to be nothing in our Salvation, or but a mere Figure and Shadow of something done in themselves; that is of their own Works of Righteousness; these in the Article of Justification, are no better than the Spider's Web. *Isa. 59. 6. Their Web shall not become Garments, neither shall they cover themselves therewith.* These will be found to be a Bed too short, and a Covering too narrow, *Isa. 28. 20. The Bed is shorter than that a Man can stretch himself on it, and a Covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it.* Nothing short of the large, perfect and everlasting Righteousness of Jesus Christ, as our Surety, will be found sufficient to clothe and adorn the Soul in the Sight of God.

IV. H. B. faith again, *We believe the Scriptures*
in

in as full and extensive a Sense as any other Christians, save only we object to their being the primary and only Rule of Faith and Practice, and the Word of God. Now H. B. has asserted an Untruth, in saying, That they believe the Scriptures in as full and extensive a Sense as any other Christians; Other Christians believe the Scriptures to be the written Word of God, you deny it. G. Fox, Great Myst. p. 302. faith, That the Scriptures are not the Ground of Faith. And that the Scriptures cannot be called the Word of God in any Sense. W. Bailey, p. 295. And G. Bishop, Me. Tek. p. 22. How dare any to say that the Scriptures are the Word of God, without the highest Blasphemy? Is this your owning and honouring the Scriptures! Is this an Evidence that you believe the Scriptures in as full and extensive a Sense as any other Christians? But I refer the Reader to the Chapter of the Scriptures; where you will see their Judgment to the full; and how little occasion they have to talk of honouring the Scriptures; even no more than those that array'd Jesus Christ in the Purple Robe and bowed the Knee to him, had reason to boast of their Esteem of and Subjection to Jesus Christ.

*V. H. B. faith, We believe a Judgment to come, or the last Judgment. But by this they intend a Man's being judged in his own Conscience, by the Light within: This is what I blam'd R. Barclay for: And so I blame you, supposing that you do indeed believe the Judgment of the great Day; then you should have said, I believe, &c. and not We believe the last Judgment; for several of your chief Leaders have been of a contrary Judgment. R. Hub. p. 49. "When was that
"Christ created, which ye say must judge the
"World? And if in Mary's Time, who was
"Judge of the World till then? Where did he
"judge*

“ judge the World, as God, till then? And as
 “ a Creature ever since? And when had the Man
 “ Christ Jesus his Beginning? If thou canst de-
 “ clare it.” *H. Norton's Answ. to Draper's Queries.*
 “ Thou askest me what I understand by the E-
 “ ternal Judgment, or whether there shall be a
 “ Time, when God shall judge all Men? I an-
 “ swer, The Eternal Judge is upon his Throne,
 “ and the Time of his Judgment is come.” So
 that when *H. B.* saith, We believe the last Judg-
 ment, he must differ from his Brethren, or else
 must prevaricate; and attempt to make us be-
 lieve what he does not hold: For their last Judg-
 ment is *begun*; and has been so, ever since Qua-
 kerism has been in the World. But I must tell
 thee, Friend, that this is but deceitful Dealing,
 and a Trick to cover thy Notions.

VI. *H. B.* saith, *We believe Heaven and Hell.*
 But others of their chief Leaders, have said that
they expected no other or better Heaven, than that
which they have now within them. Great Myst. p. 214.
There are none have a Glory and a Heaven, but
within them, which was before Man had a Being. *H.*
Norton, p. 81. The Saints can partake of no other
Glory, or Perfection, than what they now enjoy. A-
gain, I know and believe that there is no other Hea-
ven, than that the Saints are in, wherein dwells
Righteousness, Peace and joy. And that the King-
dom of Heaven is where Christ himself preach'd it,
Luke 17. 21. The Kingdom of Heaven is within you.
 This is intended of the Kingdom of the *Messias*,
 setting up the Gospel Church, that's among you;
 so it is in the Margin. And not intended of
 Grace in their Hearts: For they were not Dis-
 ciples, but unbelieving Pharisees, to whom Jesus
 Christ spake. *G. Fox* says, Great Myst. p. 101. *To*
Witness Heaven and Hell and the Resurrection [with-
in]

in] is not the Mystery of Iniquity; it being what the Scriptures bear Witness to. We answer, That if Heaven and Glory be only in this present Life, then how is Heaven above called *The Inheritance of the Saints in Light*? And how are Believers said to seek a continuing City to come? *G. Whitehead Chr. ascended. Eternal Life and Felicity is inwardly and spiritually received, by those that now suffer for Christ.* p. 37. But if Heaven is only in this Life, How are Believers said to *Walk by Faith, not by Sight*? This is a Life of *Hope*, not of perfect *Enjoyment*, as Heaven above is. And how is it said, That while we are at home in the Body we are absent from the Lord? And how can it be said of this present State, *There the wicked cease from troubling*? It is not true of this present Life. And how is that true, *That to depart and to be with Christ is far better*, if Heaven be only in this Life? But *H. B.* has put a Cheat upon us, in this Assertion also, in saying, We believe Heaven and Hell; for his Brethren tell us that these are within.

H. B. saith, with regard to the several things last mention'd; *all these Doctrines we fully, and sincerely own, as they are contain'd in the Sacred Writings.* To which I answer, That I am unskill'd in this way of Prevarication. How Men can sincerely own those things which they strenuously write against, is a great Mystery to me. This is walking in Craftiness and handling the Word of God deceitfully. It is far from Simplicity, and Godly Sincerity.

THERE are four other Doctrines which the Leaders of the Quakers have asserted, contrary to the Scriptures.

First, They deny Christ's Ascension into Heaven, and sitting at the Right Hand of God. *G. Whitehead, Light within.* p. 25. saith, That Christ's Resurrection

Resurrection is in his People. And when Mr *Burnet* had said, *That Christ was at the Right Hand of God in Heaven.* *G. Whitehead* saith, "What doth this — tend to? But to exclude both the Being of Christ out of his People; and to confine both God and Christ, and God's right Hand of Power and Being all remote from his People." Page 40. "This God, Christ and the Spirit the Quakers did not find above the Clouds, where the Baptist imagins, at such a Distance: For they never ascended to seek their Residence above the Clouds, where the Baptist tell us of finding God and Christ; tho' they were never there themselves, to find him; and it seems they are like to be without both, while they are telling of finding God and Christ above the Clouds, where they cannot come." They deny that Christ is at the right Hand of God, and coming again a Second Time, as he has expressed it, without Sin, to the Salvation of his People. *G. Whitehead, Nat. of Christianity.* 29, 30. "Dost thou look for Christ, the Son of Mary, to appear outwardly, in a bodily Existence, to save thee, according to thy Words, if thou dost, thou mayst look till thine Eyes drop out, before thou will see such an Appearance of him." *G. Keith* declares, "That at a Quakers Meeting, they censured him for saying, That Christ's Body came out of the Grave, which they say never did." And *John Whitehead* saith, *That Christ hath no Body of Flesh and Bones in Heaven.* *Qua. Ref. p. 40.* *Christ hath now no Body of Flesh Circumscrip't, or limited in that Heaven that is above, and out of every Man that is on Earth.* When one ask'd *W. Penn*, "Whether the Human Nature be a Part of the true Christ of God, now in Heaven, at the right Hand of God, making Intercession for his People?" He would

not answer a great while, at last he said, *We allow the holy Manhood to be a Member of the Christ of God.* But these are Words invented to delude the Reader: For this is no more than they will allow to every Quaker. For they hold, that the Term *Christ* belongs to every *Member* of the Body as well as to the *Head*. But it is manifest, that Jesus Christ hath the very same Body now in Heaven, which he had when he was upon the Earth; tho' we own, that it is a *glorified Body*: He told the Apostle so, after his Ascension to Heaven, *Acts 22. 8. I am Jesus of Nazareth.* And the Apostle saith plainly, *Acts 2. 36. That God hath made the very same Jesus, which was crucified, both Lord and Christ.*

Secondly, They deny the Resurrection of the Body. *W. Penn* saith, "I do utterly deny that this Text, " *1 Cor. 15. 35. 44.* is concern'd in the Resurrection " of Man's carnal Body at all, but the two States " of Men, under the first and second *Adam*." Thus he falls into the Errour of those two Hereticks *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*. *2 Tim. 2. 18.* Saying that the Resurrection is past already, and overthrow' the Faith of some. But the Apostle argues from the absurdity of denying the Resurrection of the Body, *ver. 16. If the Dead rise not, then is not Christ risen.* If the Apostle there speaks of the Resurrection of the Body only in an Allegory, then he must speak of *Christ's* Resurrection in the same Sense; and then it will follow, that if *Christ* is not risen, then our Faith is vain. The very Term *Resurrection* shews that it must be the very same Body, that rises again, and not another; for that would be *Creation*, and not *Resurrection*. Besides, if it were another Body, then a certain Body would be allotted either to Happiness or Misery, that had done neither good nor evil. But they argue, weak enough after this Manner; " How can a changed " Body

“ Body be the same for Substance ; how can a
 “ thing be the same, and yet changed ? ” We
 answer, That when the Soul is changed from
 Carnal to Spiritual, it is not another, but the same
 individual Soul. And this is evident even in things
 of Nature : The Bullion and the refined Silver
 and Gold, are both the very same Body, only the
 Dross is taken away. And even after it is re-
 fined, it is changed into several Forms, yet re-
 mains the same for Substance. So the Silk-Worm,
 is first an Egg, then a Worm, then a Fly ; yet
 it is not another Substance, tho’ it is changed
 into several Shapes ; of which it may be said,
 as of the raised Body, *God giveth it a Body, as it
 pleaseth him.* *Quest.* But does not the Apostle call
 that Man Fool, that expects the Resurrection of the
 same Body. 1 Cor. 15. 36 ? I answer No ; but on the
 contrary, he calls that Man Fool that from his Unbe-
 lief, does in Contempt ask that foolish Question, *How
 it shall come ; or with what Body ?* There shall be a great
 Change in the *Qualities* of the Body ; but it shall
 be still the same for Substance. Job 19. 25, 26, 27.
*For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he
 shall stand at the latter Day upon the Earth. And
 tho’ after my Skin, Worms destroy this Body, yet in
 my Flesh shall I see God : Whom I shall see for my
 self, and mine Eyes shall behold, and not another ;
 tho’ my Reins be consumed within me.* But W. Penn
 saith, That this Doctrine is more suitable to the
 Turkish Alcoran, than to the Bible and the Christian
 Religion, Reas. against Railing, p. 138. There’s
 their Faith of the Resurrection. But if the Re-
 surrection of the Dead, is only of something with-
 in, how is it said, that Men shall awake out of
 the Dust of the Earth ? And again, That some
 shall awake to shame and everlasting Contempt ?
 What ! shall Men be rais’d to an Estate of Grace,
 that they may be brought to everlasting Shame and

Contempt? What a contradiction is here to the holy Scriptures; and even to common Sense!

Thirdly, They hold that the Soul of Man is infinite. *Gr. M.* 29. Yet they say, that the Soul of Man must obey the Light within, and in so doing the Soul shall be saved; which amounts to thus much, that God must obey God, and then God shall be saved. *G. Fox* blames *Mr. Bine* for saying, *That the Soul of Man is a Creature.* p. 90. In these Words, "Is not the Soul of Man without Beginning? coming from God, and returning into God again? Hath this a Beginning or Ending? And is not this Infinite, in it's self? *Again*, p. 100. And is not this that cometh out from God, which is in God's Hand, part of God, of God and from God, and to God again? And is not this of God's Being?" (That is, of the very Essence of God, as they have elsewhere expressed it.) And when *Mr. Ross* had said, "It is horrid Blasphemy to say that the Soul is a Part of God." *G. Fox* answers him, "It is not horrid Blasphemy to say that the Soul is a Part of God: For it came out of him, and that which came out of him, is of him." *Great Myst.* p. 273.

THIS Assertion is not only contrary to the Scriptures, but is attended with many Absurdities. That when Man, by the Fall, became guilty and exposed himself to the Curse of the Law, and made himself liable to eternal Wrath; a part of God himself must needs be in that Condition. That's horrid Blasphemy. Again, When Jesus Christ came to redeem fallen Man, with his precious Blood; he paid down that Price to God, for a Part of God himself. That's most absurd and Blasphemous. But this is the Fruit of their leaving the Light and Rule of the holy Scriptures; and setting up the Light within, in their room.

Fourthly

Fourthly, They have asserted, that Justification and Sanctification are the same thing. *Great Myst.* p. 293. "Justification and Sanctification is one; for Christ who is the Justification and Sanctification is one." p. 295. He might have said, as truly, that Justification and Glorification, are one; for the Author of them is one. But this is ridiculous. Again, he says; "Justification is Sanctification. p. 310. Justification and Sanctification are one, not distinct one from the other, in their Nature, but are one in Nature, not two Things, really distinct, in their Nature, but really one. The same that sanctifieth a Man, justifies him. This is their unscriptural Divinity; such as the Light within teaches them.

To clear up this Matter to the meanest Capacity, and demonstrate their Mistake, in saying that *Justification and Sanctification are the same thing*; I shall give you the Definition of each of them; and then shew the Difference between them.

I. "JUSTIFICATION is an Act of God's free Grace, wherein he pardoneth all our Sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his Sight, only for the Righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by Faith alone." Wherein it is to be observed, that the Righteousness of Christ, which he alone wrought out, as our Surety, is the Matter of our Justification before God; and not any Works of Righteousness which we have done; tho' done by the Assistance of Christ, or of his Spirit. We also learn, that Faith is the means of our Justification; not our Works, either in whole, or in part

II. "SANCTIFICATION is the Work of the Spirit of God, whereby we are renewed in the whole Man, after the Image of God; and are enabled more and more, to die unto Sin and to live unto Righteousness." BY

By which Definition we learn, that Sanctification is not like patching and mending, or sewing a new Piece into an old Garment; but making *all old things to pass away, and all things to become new*. It does not consist barely in Reformation of Men's Manners; but in a Change of the Heart, and pious Disposition of the Soul. It is not like Painting or Varnishing of an old Piece of Wood; but making it new. It is not like Watering of Plants or Seeds already sown or planted, but setting or sowing something in the Heart that was not there by Nature. Sanctification is not rousing up old Powers, that were supposed to be in the Soul, by Nature; or which a Man was born with; like awaking *Samson* out of Sleep; to Exercise the Powers which he already had, tho' for a while they were unactive; but it is like raising up *Lazarus* from the Grave. It is not like washing off the Filth from old Coin; but melting it down, and stamping *Cesar's Image* upon it.

III. THE holy Scriptures teach us to distinguish between these two great Benefits. 1 Cor. 1. 30. *Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption*. Now take their Difference in the following Comparisons.

JUSTIFICATION is Pardon of Sin, and freeing the believing Soul from Condemnation.

SANCTIFICATION is a Change from Impurity to Holiness. In Justification Men obtain a Title to eternal Life; Sanctification is Meetness for Heaven. Justification is thro' the Righteousness of Christ imputed; in Sanctification the Fruits of Christ's Death are imparted to the Soul. Justification is by a Righteousness wrought out by Christ without us; Sanctification is a Righteousness

ness wrought by the Holy Spirit within us. Justification is one Act of God ; Sanctification is a gradual Work of the Spirit. Justification is by the Righteousness of one for many ; Sanctification is the restoring the Image of Christ, (consisting in Righteousness and true Holiness) on every individual Soul that shall be brought to Glory.

WE believe that no Man is justified before God, but he that is sanctified also ; and that he who justifieth and sanctifieth is one God, blessed for ever ; but it is unscriptural, and most ridiculous to affirm, that Justification and Sanctification are all one ; because God himself, the Author of both, is but one.

AND now I persuade my self, that the Impartial Reader will own, that I have had very unfair Treatment from *H. B.* thro' the whole of his Performance. If I shall have a Reply with the same lying Spirit that *H. B.* has shewn ; I shall not think it worthy of any further Notice. I can overlook Weaknesses, in honest Hearts ; but my Soul abhors Deceit and Lies.

WHATEVER may be the Event of this Affair, I have committed it to the Lord, who has the Hearts of all Men in his Hands ; and there I leave it, with Hope that this Labour shall not be in vain in the Lord ; to whom be Glory for ever. *Amen.*

F I N I S.



ERRATA.

PAGE 3. l. 29. *he is of.* p. 24. l. 10. *Years.*
p. 31. l. 7. *I answer.* p. 39. l. last. *Of the Pro-*
phesy of this Book. p. 68. l. 3. *from the bottom, they*
are. p. 96. l. 2. *Makes a Promise.* p. 162. l. 32.
for a, r. the.



37/109